

VOLUME 28 No. 2

FEBRUARY, 1922

THE Bible Champion

Established in 1889

Rev. M. M. Kilpatrick 120
655 So. 6 St.,
8) San Jose, Calif.

*Continues The Sermonizer, Student and Teacher, Preacher's Assistant,
Preacher's Magazine, and Preacher's Illustrator.*

CONTENTS

THE ARENA

A Friendly Talk with Champion Readers—Miraculous and
Supernatural Phenomena—Other Considerations Bearing
on the Flood—The Book of Proverbs—The Bible; All or
Part—The Character of Washington..... 61—85

THE SANCTUARY

Repentance 86—93

SIDELIGHTS

..... 94

PRAYER MEETING SERVICE

God has Spoken—Over Against the Treasury—the Brook
Cherith—The Wells of Salvation..... 95—96

LIBRARY TABLE

Studies in Christianity—Critical Notes on the Shorter Bible 97—110

EDITORIAL

The Present Situation—Russellism—Accounting for all
Facts—What did it?—Notes and Comments..... 111—120

FRANK J. BOYER, PUBLISHER, READING, PA.

Price \$2.00 the Year

Canada \$2.25, Foreign \$2.35

Single Copy 20 Cents

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Formerly the American Bible League

An Organization formed to promote a true knowledge of
the Bible and consequent faith in its Divine Authority.

William Phillips Hall, President

Frank J. Boyer, Secretary-Treasurer

EDITORS—David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D., William H. Bates, D.D., Herbert W. Magoun, Ph.D., Luther T. Townsend, D.D., LL.D.

Contributing Editors—William Phillips Hall, H. W. Bromley, M.A., D.D., A. William Lewis, B.D., Edwin Whittier Caswell, D.D., Charles H. Yatman, D.D., W. B. Riley, D.D., Harold Paul Sloan, D.D., Leander S. Keyser, D.D., J. L. Dickens, D.D., LL.D. William Harrison, D.D.

Frank J. Boyer, Managing Editor and Publisher, Reading, Pa.

Entered as Second-class matter, at the Postoffice, Reading, Pa., under act of March 3, 1897

Important Instructions: All mail should be addressed to, and all Money Orders and Drafts should be made payable to, Frank J. Boyer, Reading, Pa.

Change in Address—It is very important that Old as well as New address be given. Always allow at least 10 days to make a change.

Expirations and Renewals—Your subscription expires with the month and year printed on your Address Label. When renewing please state that your remittance is for a **renewal**. We receipt new subscriptions by starting the magazine, and renewal subscriptions by changing your address label. A subscription blank enclosed in your magazine indicates your subscription has expired, and we earnestly solicit your prompt renewal.

Discontinuance—We find that many of our subscribers preferred not to have their subscriptions interrupted in case they fail to remit before expiration; therefore, by authority of the U. S. Post-office Department, we can extend reasonable credit when necessary, and all subscribers are **expected to notify us** to stop magazine if it is no longer desired.

You Can't Improve

The old historic method for bringing blessing to the households of faith that the family altar has always represented. Everywhere souls are hungry for the spiritual vitamins that shall give to the soul the health that means holiness. Intellectual husks aren't satisfying.

No revival of pentecostal fervor will ever come to the church until it shall begin at the family altar. A new day will come in religious achievement when age and sex have their spiritual needs met in the holy atmosphere that a household of faith alone can produce.

Modern conditions demand an adaptation of pastoral service to meet the problem of maintaining a family religious life. Many ministers are searching out ways of satisfying these needs of the Christian home.

Send 10c for the postage on a sample packet of literature, including a free copy of "The Christian Home Magazine" and a booklet "A Suggested Program for a Family Altar Day."

Address

THE FAMILY ALTAR LEAGUE
541 Marquette Bldg.

Chicago

Illinois

Rev. W. E. Biederwolf, President.

Rev. Wm. Matthew Holderby, Gen. Sec.

Sermon Outlines

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 4

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons, contributed by fifty different ministers, aiming at originality and suggestiveness of arrangement, price.....50c

Sketches of Revival Sermons No. 5

Are by Rev. Wm. J. Stevenson, D. D., singularly original, and suggestive; 60 full Sketches of Sermons, price.....50c

Sketches of Funeral Sermons

Contains sixty full Sketches of Sermons for Funeral Occasions, contributed by fifty different ministers, like No. 4. It also contains fifty carefully selected Texts for Funeral Sermons, price.....50c

The Tool Basket

A collection of 300 Sermon Outlines, Pegs of Thought, Sunday-School Addresses, etc., gathered from various sources and grouped together in convenient form for the express purpose of helping to fix upon some suitable subject, thus affording assistance in time of need and emergency.

100 pages, bound in flexible cloth, oblong, indexed thoroly for ready reference by subjects and texts, price.....50c

"Admirable; the sort of thing that is invaluable to busy workers."—Rev. Mark Guy Pearse.

Sketches of Sermons on the Lord's Prayer

By J. C. Hornberger, D.D., price.....10c

The Bible League of North America



THE Bible League of North America, then called the American Bible League, was organized in the year of our Lord 1903 to effect "the promotion everywhere of a devout, constructive study of the Bible, as a whole and in its various books and parts, by the common sense and rational, or truly scientific, method, and with the aid of all the light that can be thrown upon it from all sources, and the meeting and counteracting of the errors now current concerning its truthfulness, integrity and authority."

The second article of its Constitution declares: "It shall be the object of this League to organize the friends of the Bible, to promote a more thorough, reverential and constructive study of the Sacred Volume, and to retain the historic faith of the Church in its divine inspiration and supreme authority as the Word of God."

At the Second Convention of the League, held at Park Street Congregational Church, Boston, in 1904, the writer, among other things, said: "In the prosecution of its high purpose the League aims to avail itself of the coöperative assistance of the ablest and most highly accredited scholarship that the conservative school affords; and in its enterprise plans to give all sane and sound Biblical criticism its proper place.

"To search the Scriptures for the imperishable gold of God's eternal truth is indeed most Christly and commendable, and to devote oneself to such search in the spirit and with the methods of a truly reverent and scientific scholarship is but to yield obedience to the Spirit and teachings of our Divine Lord. For such Christ-like critical study of God's Word the American Bible League most strenuously stands.

"In the full enjoyment of that blood-bought liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, we joyfully engage in that most noble of all the undertakings of a truly Christian scholarship, the study of the oracles of the Most High; and thus devoting ourselves to the acquisition of a more complete knowledge of the words and will of God, we fear no damage to faith in the Divine inspiration, integrity, and authority of the blessed Book.

"We shall make no bid for the full acquiescence of a blind and unreasoning faith in the correctness of our conclusions, but rather, by the teachings of a scholarship of unchallenged ability, we shall endeavor to commend ourselves and our cause to the favorable judgment of all friends who acknowledge the supreme authority of our Lord Jesus Christ in all matters of faith and practice."

Although more than seventeen years have passed since the words just quoted were originally uttered, we have had no reason to change our mind, nor our position so declared.

Today, more than ever in the past, is the work of the Bible League called for, and it is cause for devout thanksgiving to our dear Lord that there still remain more than seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of a false scholarship and a faith destroying criticism of the Word of God.

To that more than seven thousand we appeal to come up to the help of the Lord against the mighty forces of unbelieving and destructive scholarship, and to actively coöperate with our good brother, Frank J. Boyer, now General Secretary-Treasurer of the League, in his splendid work of carrying on the publication and distribution of the BIBLE CHAMPION throughout the land.

The names of George Frederick Wright, Luther Tracy Townsend, Herbert W. Magoun, David James Burrell, William H. Bates and many others who are contributing to the magazine assure us of the extraordinary value of the same in the vitally important work that is being accomplished thereby.

May all true friends of the Bible subscribe for the BIBLE CHAMPION and also secure its widest possible circulation among their friends and acquaintances, and may the blessings of our Lord Jesus Christ richly rest upon all who may send a favorable response to this appeal!

WILLIAM PHILLIPS HALL, *President*

**Many times
the last
year we've
been asked**

CONCERNING Certain Pamphlets published by the Bible League of North America. Those named below may now be had. Of some there are not many copies. Of others there are more. We offer what we have at Reduced Prices. Do not delay ordering. When this lot is sold all will be out of print.

Look this List over---Order at once---All sent prepaid

- Constructive Studies in Matthew, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for\$2.50
- Constructive Studies in John, Dr. Gregory, 50c edition, now 35c each, or dozen for 2.50
- NOTE—West of Mississippi River price for above 2 pamphlets is 40c ea; or \$3.00 per doz.
- The Higher Criticism, Dr. Sharaton, 20c Pocket edition, now 15c each, or dozen for 1.50
- The Higher Criticism: A Present Appraisal, 10c each, per dozen..... .75
- From Pulpit to Poor House, Dr. Hamilton, \$1.00 cloth edition, now..... .60
- Counterfeit Criticism of Scriptures, Dr. Hamilton, 10c edition, now 6c ea. doz.....50
- The Editor in the Pulpit, Dr. Hamilton, 5c edition, now 4c each, or dozen for 40
- Letters on Higher Criticism, Dr. Ridout, 10c edition, 10c each, or dozen for..... .75
- Hume's Essays on Miracles and Studies in Theology, by Judge Lamb, 5c each, or dozen for 40

Cloth Bound Volumes Preacher's Assistant

\$1.75 each, for volumes as fol.:

Any year from 1889 to 1905—average about 450pp.

These volumes will prove a valuable addition to any preacher's working library. They are filled with available material for Pulpit preparation for ordinary and special occasions.

Single numbers of any we may have on hand may be had for 10c each. Try several numbers—you will find them valuable.

Cloth Bound books by Dr. Townsend

Published to sell at \$1.00, \$1.25, \$1.50
Your choice at 50c—3 books for \$1.25

Bible Theology and Modern Thought
God-Man—Search and Manifestation
Sword and Garment
The Arena and the Throne

25c Religious Tract and Pamphlet Package

Send us 25c for a worthwhile package of timely Religious Pamphlets and Tracts—fully 50c worth, and more! Try one!

FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading, Pa.

Cloth Bound Vols. Bible Champion **\$2.25 each for volumes as fol.:**

- Volume VIII—January to June, 1908
“ IX—July to December, 1908
“ X—January to June, 1909
“ XII—January to June, 1910
“ XIII—July to December, 1910
“ XIV—January, 1911 to April, 1912
“ XXIV—January to December, 1918
“ XXV—January to December, 1919
“ XXVI—January to December, 1920

Single numbers Champion, any number previous to July, 1918, at 5c each, to close out. Any number from July, 1918 to date, at 10c each. Please note that we cannot supply numbers for full years for any year previous to July, 1918, but can supply any number, at this time, from July 1918, to date.

Cloth Bound Volumes Sermonizer **\$1.75 each for years as fol.:**

1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916:

Cloth Bound Volumes Sermonizer **\$2.25 each for years as fol.:**

1917, 1918.

Have nearly every number Sermonizer from 1910 to 1918, single numbers, which we will supply at 10c each. Ministers will find these numbers very valuable for pulpit preparation, as they contain only Homiletic helps—Sermons, Outlines of Sermons, and other Homiletic literature.

Pamphlets by Dr. L. T. Townsend **10c each—3 pamphlets for 25c**

The New Theology only Bubbles

Bible Inspiration

Paul's Cloak, or Consecration

God and the Nation

Primitive Orthodoxy & Progressive Orthodoxy

Cloth Bound Volumes Preacher's Magazine

Special Price \$1.00 each, Prepaid—Great Value

Complete set of 11 volumes, \$10.00, not prepaid. Each volume contains about 576pp, 6¼x9½ in. They sold originally at \$2.50 each, or \$21.00 the set, and are fully worth that price to any minister.

THE BIBLE CHAMPION

Official Organ of the Bible League of North America

Volume 28

FEBRUARY, 1922

No. 2

The Arena

A Friendly Talk with Champion Readers

BY M. W. HERBERTUS.



IT thee down, friend, and let us chat a bit. It will do thee no harm and may be of some use to both of us. Witest thou that thou hast in the CHAMPION? It is the official organ of the Bible League of North America, and it really stands for something. Verily, thou art getting thy money's worth.

One of the editors—I know him intimately—recently made a computation. He reads the proof of the CHAMPION and also of another religious periodical, and he found that the CHAMPION gives thee about four and a half times as much for thy cash as the other subscribers get for theirs! Canst thou beat it?

When the professor learned of this, he argued that the subscribers of the CHAMPION ought to pay four and a half times as fast as the others. Do they do so? No: they pay four and a half times as slow! Art thou one of the tortoises? If so, obey that impulse and send in thy shekels.

Verily, the editors work for nothing, all of them, and the publisher works for less; for does he not publish at a loss on every number? He does, and it is largely because the subscribers do not pony up as they should. How about thyself? Art thou lacking? Why not do thy bit like the rest and help to make the CHAMPION of real help to the world? Surely there is need enough for it.

Hast thou ought against it? Mayhap thou hast. What is it? Does thou dislike the title? Couldst thou talk it up to thy friend better if it were THE BIBLE ADVOCATE? Just between us, I dislike the title too. Indeed, I would not read the numbers sent me till Professor Wright asked me to do so. Then I found out that the magazine was all right on the inside.

I mean as to contents. It was all right as to form then; but the publisher tried to give us too much and changed the pages. The professor asked Blueberry Queen about them, and she told him they were too long and hard to read—like a treatise. He saw the point, and he told Mr. Boyer, and Mr. Boyer will try to fix it up and make those pages easy once more. Say, Boyer's all right!

Confidentially, Blueberry Queen said another thing. She said that CHAMPION was not a good name—it was not dignified—it gave the impression of cheapness! What do you know about that? The professor knew her to be a woman of uncommon sense, and he gave heed accordingly. What thinkest thou? Was she right? Does the Bible need a fighter or a friend? For myself I say a friend. I do not feel qualified to take the Book under my wing for protection. It helps me.

What else gnaws thee? Did Dr. Magoun step on thy pet corn when he denied that the world was made in six days, or one hundred and forty-four hours? And didst thou forthwith write him down as unscientific and an ignoramus, because, forsooth, he did not agree with thee in this matter?

If so, tell me, friend, where didst thou get thy information? Wast thou on hand when the Almighty did the job? Didst thou give Him pointers? Hast thou a friend among the angels who giveth thee inside information? Or dost thou depend for thy information upon the English Bible? Really, I would like to know.

If the last is the source of thy knowledge, hast thou forgotten that it is but a poor translation at best, and that the Hebrew original must still be reckoned with? That is, sad to say, the actual

fact. Hast thou reckoned with the Hebrew and corrected its text to fit thy ideas?

Let me tell thee what I learned of the professor. Including *yomam*, "by day," which is almost invariably connected with an expression meaning "by night," and *yom yom*, "day by day," "each day," "every day," the word *yom* is used in the Old Testament over twelve hundred times, and not once canst thou say with positiveness that it meaneth a period of twenty-four hours! Indeed, it is safe to say that it never meaneth that, albeit it may seem to do so!

When night is included, the fact is stated, as in Ex. x. 13; 1 Sam. xix. 24; 1 Ki. viii. 29; Esth. iv. 16; Ps. xix. 2, lxxiv. 16, lxxxviii. 1; Ecc. viii. 16; and Is. xxvii. 3, xxxviii. 12-13; lxii. 6. Moreover, night and day are plainly contrasted, as in 2 Sam. iii. 35; Job iii. 4, xvii. 12; Ps. cxxxix. 21; Jer. vi. 4; Amos v. 8, 18, 20; Mic. iii. 6; and Zeph. i. 15.

Joshua's "whole day" (x. 13) is no exception, and the rare passages where night may be understood are not, as 2 Sam. xi. 12; 1 Chron. xxix. 21; and Esth. iii. 7; for, verily, thou hast heard of Synecdoche, and that is the principle which covereth such cases. It is especially common with *yamim*, "days," which time and again means some definite period,—“the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years.” Moreover, the same is true in English.

Now, the form *yamim* occurs about six hundred and sixty times, and thou mayest find considerable material that will give thee comfort therein, until thou goest to the Century Dictionary for assistance. Then will thy hopes be dashed. Verily, "day" in English meaneth, properly, the period of daylight. It also meaneth "time" of indefinite duration, and that is what *yom* means. The period of daylight is of that sort. Dost thou realize that? A day in December must needs add about fifty per cent. of itself to obtain the length of a day in June—hast thou thought of that?

Yom in the sense of time—day is used the same way in English—is common.

Indeed, the reference above beginning with Amos might be so grouped with profit and accuracy. Consider Job xv. 23, where "day of darkness" is a euphemism for death, and Zech. xiv. 7, where "one day" means a period of time. Even the common expression "unto this day" really means up to the present time; for, otherwise, it must needs change its meaning every twenty-four hours!

If thou wouldst look up *yamim*, consider Gen. vii. 4, 12, 17, 24; Ex. xxiv. 16, 18; Deut. ix. 9, 11, 18, 25, x. 10, xi. 9, 21; etc. If the matter is not yet clear, go to thy Century Dictionary and study the use of "days" in thine own mother tongue. What dost thou mean by "every dog has his day?" or by "my day and generation?" Verily, "day" in English is a broken reed on which to put thy reliance in this matter. Indeed, it was by synecdoche that it first came to mean twenty-four hours; but the figure has now faded out and been forgotten. And the Greek of the New Testament is like unto the English and the Hebrew.

Verily, thy creation days are things of thine own imagination; for there is nothing in the Bible to support them! Indeed, the professor found not words to express his idea of such rattle-pated notions as that, and I did not press him lest he say something not perfectly polite.

Never mind. He once had such notions himself. Let me tell thee one on him. He grew up believing that the Red Sea was split in two and that the fishes swam up and viewed the people as they passed by. When he finally learned that the Hebrew contained no warrant whatever for any such notion, was he shocked? Well, he was and then some. But he was honest and he got over it.

That is his weak spot. A man that is not honest never has to change his mind, while one that is honest does have to do just that. The professor had to, and he took his medicine! Now, he wants to help other benighted souls. And, say, that man prays daily for light and to be kept from error. Dost thou?

The CHAMPION grows better each month. Wish a copy could go into the hands of all our young ministers—and it would be a great help to many of the older ones. Could I have had something of the kind 50 years ago when I entered the ministry, what a help it would have been. May large measures of success attend your efforts in defence of the truth.—Rev. E. Hopkins.

The Fact of Miraculous and Supernatural Phenomena in the Early Christian Church as Testified to by the Apostle Paul

BY WILLIAM HOULISTON, MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA



HIS is distinctively the age of scepticism and positive unbelief regarding the supernatural element in the historical setting, and in the doctrines of Christianity. Perhaps the chief provoking cause of this hostility in the popular thought to this history, and to these doctrines, is the influence of a very general acceptance of the Darwinian hypothesis of evolution, with the added assumption that this supernatural element is utterly incompatible with the hypothesis.

Now, without stopping to discuss the validity of either this assumption, or of the hypothesis of evolution itself, neither of which have been satisfactorily proved, and both of which are today vigorously and intelligently contested, especially is this so of the evolutionary principles of "natural selection" and the "survival of the fittest" or the element of mere chance which attaches to the hypothesis of evolution as set forth by Darwin and Heckel, let us pass on to say that quite as operative in the phenomenon of opposition to the history and doctrine of the Christian church is what the apostle in the letter to the Hebrews has called "the evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God," which wields a very real influence at all times upon the thought and conduct of men and women.

At no time in the history of the world has this evil heart of unbelief been subjected to such assiduous and systematic cultivation as within the last half century,—the period coincident with the feverish activities of the so called higher criticism of the Bible, the influence of which, while it is certainly doomed to fail in destroying the word of God, has not failed to weaken or destroy the Christian faith of thousands of men and women, and to fortify the unbelieving world in its unbelief. This was indeed its most "assured result."

Now, this evil heart of unbelief is already sufficiently stubborn and obdurate without any such modern reinforcement,—sufficiently inaccessible to evidence, sufficiently proof against persuasion. It was precisely His penetrating perception and philosophical insight into this peculiar psychology of the man with the evil heart of unbelief that prompted Jesus to put into the mouth of Abraham when, in the parable of "the Rich man and Lazarus" in reply to the appeal of Dives that a messenger from the dead should be sent to his brethren to warn them of their peril, he said "they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them, but if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

Obviously this would be the temper and conduct of the modern destructive biblical critic in such circumstances, as the rising from the dead would involve a miracle, and objection to miracles and the supernatural generally, which constitute at once the basis and the inspiration of his system of criticism, would close his mind to any testimony purporting to come from such a source. The phenomenon might puzzle him for an instant, but he would quickly endeavor to find some explanation that would satisfy his unbelief, and would promptly reject the testimony. Abhorrence of the supernatural is a fetish with him, and the source of his zeal is assailing the sacred Scriptures. To this, everything must yield and be sacrificed, every religious idea or doctrine no matter how ancient or cherished, or how valid the authority upon which it rests,—the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the Bible; the authenticity and historicity of its books; practically the whole biography of Christ from his conception in flesh and blood in the womb of Mary by the power of the Holy Spirit, to His bodily resurrection from the dead. To such a man, any statement of a man claiming to have arisen from the dead would be promptly and contemptuously rejected.

Although these thoughts have no close connection with the subject which has been chosen for discussion, they will not fail, it is expected, to prove their persuasive value when a closer and sustained discussion of the main subject is reached, so permission will be taken to pursue them a while longer, and ask the following questions: However at variance, apparently, with the known processes and laws of nature any phenomenon may be, is there, properly speaking, any justification in denominating it supernatural? There is nothing supernatural in the universe but God. He only is *supra naturam*,—that is to say, above nature. He is the Creator of the universe, of all its matter, forces, processes and laws, which are ever subject to His will and control. Indeed, are not the natural so called forces, laws and phenomena just the visible manifestations of the divine immanence in the universe, sustaining and directing its operations and development, not, indeed, in the pantheistic sense, but in the sense of an ever and everywhere present intelligent and omnipotent agent with an intelligent design in view.

And, considering that the regnant purpose and object of the universe is a moral one; that the universe is intended as the theatre or school for the moral development of moral beings,—else it is without any conceivable intelligent purpose,—it is not only probable, but quite likely that God has provided for, and made place in the universe for, special divine interposition of His power precisely to meet the need of this moral development.

To be specific, has He not provided for answers to prayer in the scheme of the universe, in accordance with His gracious promises and His fatherly love and care of His true children? May He not, also, have provided for miraculous power, and supernatural phenomena as a very necessary attestation of His ruling presence in the universe, to give sanction to His moral law? He certainly did. Christ attested His divine personality and mission precisely in this way, and a very little reflection will reveal the fact that nothing short of this could ever have secured this recognition in the world of men and women. Everywhere He went, and every time, this was the chief basis of such recognition.

One example will be sufficient, and it is conspicuous. It is the case of Nicodemus. "Rabbi," said Nicodemus, "we know thou art a teacher sent from God for no *man* can do these miracles that thou doest, except *God* be with him." The prophetic sign, too, that was given for His identification, was, chiefly, His miracle working; see Luke 7:19-23, and Isaiah 35:4, 5, 6.

But the most striking use of this power by Christ finds record in every one of the synoptic gospels where Jesus deliberately purposed before a large group in Capernaum (See Mark 2:3-12; Matt. 9:2-7; Luke 5:18-25) which included Pharisees and doctors of the law,—and quite likely with special reference to the presence of the latter,—to actually demonstrate or prove His identity with God, and His right, therefore, to exercise the prerogatives of God, by showing His absolute control of natural law, or His power in the natural world, when He healed the paralytic. Mark, in recording the incident, says "and they were all amazed" which, of course, included the Pharisees and the doctors of the law.

It will, of course, be contended by the critic that it is not a question of possibilities that is in dispute, but of actualities; not of what God can do, but of what He actually does; that His processes as seen in nature round about us are uniform, fixed and changeless; that He does not, as a matter of fact and observation, interfere with this uniformity and established order, arbitrarily interjecting extra-natural processes into it now and then, and that miracles, which he assumes to be of that nature, are not now seen, do not now appear, and that this latter fact, which he also assumes, is conclusive proof that such phenomena never did exist, or never were manifested at any time, and that, therefore, the miracles and supernatural phenomena recorded in the gospels are untrue.

But, it will be difficult for him to explain and justify his inconsistency in rejecting the testimony of the gospels concerning the miracles in the life of Christ on such grounds while he, at the same time, unquestioningly accepts the testimony of the rocks, and of the bones of animals as to the hypothesis of evo-

lution,—biological evolution in the past, when the evidence of its operation in nature at the present time is absolutely wanting. Proto-plasm, plasson, and the primordial cell are still with us as in primeval times. The monera and the amebæ from which the whole phylogenetic process started and progressed through myriads of living forms till man was at length developed, according to the theory of evolution, which is the critic's chief ground of objection to miracles and the supernatural, are with us still, but there is not a shadow of a sign of the operation of this evolutionary process going on now.

There may be, indeed, if the conclusions of science can be relied upon on this point, signs, here and there, of degenerating processes, but of the climb toward a higher development nothing positive.

Does the critic suggest that the evidence for evolution is tangible and visible in the paleontological fossils and osteological relics of a past age, whereas no such traces remain to bear testimony to the miracles of Christ, and that therefore there is no analogy between the two cases?

The reply is that the evidence of miraculous operation in the present by a miracle working Christ is abundant; and when added to the evidence reaching us from the historical records of the gospels, of the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistolary writings of the apostle Paul, which constitute the counterpart to the paleontological testimony of the evolutionary hypothesis, the proof of miracles both in the present and in the apostolic church is better and more conclusive than the proof sought to be established for biological evolution by the paleontological and osteological testimony; for, apart from well attested, unmistakable answers to prayer, based upon the testimony of men and women whose character, intelligence and culture in many cases render it unimpeachable, when the gift of healing is manifestly exercised by several evangelists as they have taught and wrought in many of our largest cities in these very times; when a life and character such as Jerry McCaulay's, not to mention hundreds of others in the records of history, is radically changed almost instantaneously by a conviction wrought in the soul by the miracle-working spirit of Christ, and all by simply fulfilling the unique requirement imposed by Christ as the condition of his miraculous interposition, viz: by faith or trust in Him, or, when a tribe or people like the Fiji Islanders, who were savage cannibals of the lowest type for centuries, are changed into a civilized people, and, in the language of prophecy "a nation is born in a day," practically, and when the highest and best civilizations of the world are those which have the most sympathetically felt, and surrendered themselves to the transforming and renewing power of the spirit of Christ, and His superlative ethical and religious teaching, the evidence of His wonder working presence and power in the world is manifest.

These are facts, and the mere denial of these facts, and of the truth and authenticity of the gospels and epistles,—a denial born entirely of hostile prejudice and the "evil heart of unbelief," and standing upon absolutely no proof whatever, can not be admitted as of any cogency or value in the discussion, and can not vitiate in the slightest, evidence and testimony which will stand the test of all the accepted rules of evidence in use in courts of justice for centuries, and by all jural science.

It is high time to wake up to the fact that scepticism and unbelief are purely negative principles. They have no evidential quality or value. No man's unbelief, though multiplied a thousandfold, and buttressed by the unbelief of scores of critical professors in the schools, has the slightest effect upon a historical fact. It leaves every issue in any dispute precisely where it was. Unbelief proves nothing but the unbelief of the unbeliever, no more.

But again, the critic may insist, this evidence is not tangible like the evidence for evolution (which is true in a sense) for matter only is tangible, but it is equally real. Not everything that is real is apprehended by the sensory nerves, and much evades even scientific tests. Love is not tangible, but it is real. It cannot be measured, weighed, examined under a microscope, or analysed in the chemical laboratory, but it is real. It is not only real, but it is

a tremendously potent force in the life of individuals and of the world. A moral force, of course, but a moral force that frequently controls, moves and commands stupendous physical forces. Love, hate, what are they? Just two antithetical passions of the soul, but in the mighty conflict between these two human passions which raged for four years upon the lands and seas of the old world, modern civilization has been almost wrecked. Hate,—insane, jealous, envious hatred of England by the German, cultivated in his mind and soul for decades, and nurtured and fostered in the *volkschulen*, and in the songs of Germany's children and youth, on the one hand, and on the other, love in the hearts of the people of Belgium and France for their imperilled families and native lands, and love and sympathy for outraged and suffering humanity, on the part of the succoring allies, these were the forces that marshalled the armies, and moved the navies of the contending hosts, and in the mighty clash of the material forces thus controlled, 40,000,000, perhaps, of the human family have ultimately perished from the earth, large areas in Belgium, France, Poland, Serbia and elsewhere were indescribably devastated, and desolated, and billions of the world's treasure scattered to the four winds,—and the end is not yet.

These introductory thoughts bring us now to the intimate discussion of our subject, and the class of evidence which will be used in support of the contention that miracles and the supernatural element were actually present in the early Christian church will be found to be incontrovertible. It is clear, definite, and bears upon its own face the marks of its validity.

No use will be made in this discussion of the writings of the gospel historians, valid as their testimony certainly is, for the modern critic has placed them in a false light, and brought their testimony into question in many minds. Liberty, however, will be taken to refer to, and to quote one narrative from Luke's "Acts of the Apostles," not indeed for evidential purposes, but to point out the identity of the phenomenon therein described with one of the supernatural manifestations found in the literature which shall be used in evidence, and which can not be set aside by any of the objections urged against literature of the historical type. Nevertheless, the evidence which shall be used will, incidentally, go far toward proving the probability of truth in the historical narrative.

The matter which will furnish our evidence in this discussion will be found in I Corinthians, 12, and will be quoted at length presently, and, to forestall any objection which might be raised as to its use, on any question of authorship, which is a very convenient trick of the modern critic, let it be said here that the cogency of the evidence contained in the letter, and its use in this argument, does not depend upon the authorship of the letter,—though that question will also be satisfactorily proved before this article is concluded,—but upon certain facts, clearly evident to every thinking mind, which appear in and through the matter from this letter which will be put in evidence. This matter bears irrefutable testimony to the existence and manifestation of miraculous and supernatural phenomena in the apostolic church,—testimony strikingly analogous to, and quite as palpable, if not to the senses, at least to the reason and intelligence, as is the testimony of osteology and paleontology to the existence of biological evolution in a past age.

First then, let us take the historical statement from Luke's gospel concerning the effusion of the Spirit at Pentecost, and then take the passages from Paul's letter, and note the confirmatory testimony which they bear to the truth of Luke's story of the "gift of tongues." Turn to Acts 2:1-13 inclusive which reads:

1. And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.
2. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind and it filled all the house where they were sitting.
3. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.
4. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.
5. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under Heaven.

6. Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language.
7. And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold are not all which speak Galileans?
8. And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?
9. Parthians, and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia,
10. Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes.
11. Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our own tongue the wonderful works of God.
12. And they were all amazed, and were in doubt, saying one to another, what meaneth this?

Now observe in the foregoing quotations just what was this gift of tongues, and it must be evident to everyone that it was nothing more nor less than the gift of speaking in a language or in languages other than the natural or mother tongue of the speaker; one he had never learned, and with which he was unacquainted. It may be, and very likely was restricted in its use to the proclamation of the gospel, and to Christian exhortation in their religious assemblies. This passage, then, from the Acts of the Apostles is the testimony of the gospel historian Luke to the appearance of this miraculous gift at the dawn of the Christian church.

Now let us turn to Paul's first letter to the church at Corinth, to which reference has already been made, and read some passages from the 12th Chapter which have a direct bearing upon this miraculous endowment described by Luke:

7. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.
8. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit;
9. To another faith, by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit;
10. To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another the discerning of spirits; to another *divers kinds of tongues*; to another the interpretation of tongues; etc., etc.—the whole chapter should be carefully read.

Now let us examine and analyze this confirmatory testimony of Paul to the existence and exercise of this miraculous endowment in the apostolic church, and thus place the testimony of the historian Luke beyond the possibility of reasonable question.

The apostle is here exhorting the Corinthian Church on the subject of spiritual gifts, and in the course of his exhortation drops into an argument or discussion with reference to the distribution of these gifts in the Christian Church, endeavoring to correct some wrong and harmful impression to the effect that any member might aspire to a multiplicity of these spiritual gifts, and among them appears the "gift of tongues," which consists as here also appears, in being empowered to speak another or other languages than one's own, by direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. He not only refers to these miraculous gifts as actually existing and being exercised in the Church, but endeavors to clinch an argument as to the division of the gifts, and as to the limitation of each specific gift to specific individuals by appealing to the observation and personal consciousness of the Corinthian Christians, of the fact as exhibited in the congregations of which they formed a part. He does this by putting to them the questions found in the 29 verse of this same chapter, viz,—“Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? Do all *speak with tongues*?” etc. He is not talking to them of matters of history of a thousand years before, but of things which were happening just then, at the moment of his dictating this letter, and appeals to their own personal knowledge of the facts.

Fancy a man like Paul appealing to the personal knowledge and consciousness of men about things which did not exist, and never could, if the modern critic is right, and attempting to base an argument upon the same. The absurdity of such a supposition is too palpable for argument. Moreover in the 18th verse of the 14th Chapter of this same letter the apostle asserts that he himself possessed and exercised this gift of tongues in larger measure than did

any of the members of the Church at Corinth to which he was writing. If a man can not trust his own consciousness and the testimony of his own senses then there is an end to all reason.

Now there is a striking analogy between this testimony of Paul to the miraculous manifestations prevalent in the apostolic church and age and the paleontological testimony to the process of evolution in some remote geologic age.

Paul's letter, figuratively speaking, is a fragment taken from the literary deposits of the race laid down some two thousand years ago, bearing indisputable evidence to the existence of miraculous or supernatural phenomena during the nascent period of the Christian Church, and thus confirming the historian Luke's account of the same miraculous manifestation at Pentecost in the city of Jerusalem, and, at the same time putting a stamp of genuineness and truthfulness upon all that has come to us from the pen of that graphic and cultured historian. The osteologic relic or paleontological fossil, in the same way, laid down in the geological deposits of many thousand years ago, may bear testimony now to a process of biological evolution in operation then, but not manifest now. Must we believe the latter testimony, and can we be reasonably denied the right to believe the former?

Now what can be claimed for the mental acumen of a class of alleged scholars and Bible critics, who in a critical study of that book have overlooked or failed to recognize in these writings of the apostle Paul such indubitable evidence of the presence of miraculous phenomena in the apostolic church, and, logically, of the probable truth of the gospel miracles, which they persistently deny, or if they have noticed it, what must we think of the honesty and soundness of their judgment in ignoring and rejecting it?

To deny or even to disprove Paul's authorship of this letter, which they never can do to satisfy a rational mind, would not help their position any, nor deliver them from this troublesome testimony, for, written by whomsoever it may be, the reference to the existence of miraculous gifts at the time of the planting of this church, the argument as to the distribution of the gifts, based upon it, and the appeal to the Corinthian congregation as to their personal knowledge of the facts fully sustains it.

But that Paul was the writer of this letter is so patent on its face, the inherent evidence of his authorship are so overwhelming, that no one has ever seriously attempted to dispute it. Let us very briefly examine this question.

Luke, in the 18 Chapter of the "Acts of the Apostles," records how Paul, in his second missionary tour, visited Corinth, became acquainted and made his home with Aquilla, a Jew, a native of Pontus, who with his wife had recently arrived from Rome, urged to leave Rome by a command from the Emperor Claudius that all Jews should withdraw from that city. He tells us that Paul was attracted to this Jewish home because, like himself, Aquilla and his wife were tent makers, and that he worked with them, and supported himself in this way. He records how Paul was in the habit of frequenting the Jewish Synagogue there Sabbath after Sabbath, and of speaking there; that his speaking resulted in the conversion of Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, and all his household, and many of the Jews; that it resulted also in a violent opposition on the part of the Jews, and his expulsion from the synagogue; that he resumed his teaching in the house of Justus adjoining the synagogue; that he there organized and founded, and for 18 months continued to nurture and build up the church of Corinth.

Now this account by Luke of the planting of the Corinthian church by Paul is confirmed by the writer of this letter to the Corinthians who says of this church "*I planted; Apollos watered, but God caused it to grow.*"

Examining this letter we find it begins with the salutation "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God unto the church which is at Corinth," etc. "Sosthenes" is purposely omitted in this quotation, because Paul simply joins Sosthenes with himself in the salutation only. Sosthenes has no part whatever in the letter, as will be seen, for the writer everywhere, ad-

dressing the church, speaks in the first person singular, *e. g.* "When *I* came unto you brethren, I came not in excellency of speech," etc. "*I* planted; Apollos watered," etc. "Last of all he was seen of *me* also, as of one born out of due time, for *I* am the least of the apostles, and am not worthy to be called an apostle, because *I* persecuted the church of God." This is a significant passage, and establishes the identity of the writer of the letter beyond dispute.

Christ chose twelve apostles only. Paul was not one of them. The twelve were chosen at the beginning of Christ's public ministry, and were with him to the end. They were therefore chosen "in due time," to use Paul's phrase, and none of them ever persecuted the church of God. But Paul, the only other apostle chosen by Christ, was chosen after Christ had died and had arisen from the dead; after Christ's earthly ministry had closed, and therefore "out of due time" so far as that particular ministry was concerned, and he was the only apostle, so far as history records, who ever persecuted the church of God, or the early Christian church.

When he is closing the letter as when he opens it, he further identifies himself in these words: "the salutation of me Paul, with mine own hand." Thus Luke who was the companion of, and colaborer with Paul in his missionary work, and who was, therefore, in a position to know the facts, says that Paul planted the Christian Church at Corinth, and the writer of this letter to the church at Corinth says that he planted the church, thus identifying himself as Paul, and as he calls himself Paul in the opening salutation of the letter, and repeats his identification in the closing one, the evidence is complete and incontestible that Paul the apostle, and the founder of the church at Corinth, was the author of this letter to that church. Besides all this, the letter is exceedingly characteristic of Paul.

It is needless to say that the explanatory postscript which appears at the end of the letter is no part of the letter. Moreover, the information which it purports to give, as to where the letter was written, and by whom it was written is obviously incorrect. It states that it was written at Philippi, whereas it appears on its face to have been written at Ephesus; see Chapter 16, which is the very last chapter, where, at the 8th verse, the writer declares it to be his intention to remain at Ephesus until the coming Pentecost. He says also, in the 5th verse, that he purposed passing through Macedonia when he should return to Corinth. If, therefore, he was purposing to go to Macedonia when he wrote the letter, it is quite evident that he was not in Philippi when he wrote it, as Philippi was one of the chief cities of Macedonia.

This postscript also says that the letter was written by Stephanas, Fortunatus, Achaicus and Timotheus, but a reference to the 17 and 18 verses of this last chapter shows that the writer of the letter speaks of these men as recently come to visit him, and as having brought refreshing to his spirit because that they, as coming from the province of Achaia of which Corinth was the capital, had, by their presence, in some measure satisfied the yearning of his spirit for the fellowship of the Corinthian congregation, from which he was cut off by his absence. This is the meaning of Paul's rather obscure language in these verses as a careful reading of the original text will show (read in connection also the 15 and 16 verses).

Finally, as he is about to make his closing salutation in the letter, the writer, Paul, recommends them to the respectful consideration and obedience of the Corinthian congregation. Evidently, then, they were about to return to Corinth, their presence at Ephesus on this occasion was only temporary,—a visit, in fact,—and quite likely, when they were about to return, they were handed this letter and became the bearers of it to the Corinthian church. This was probably their only relation to the letter. It is not probable, for obvious reasons, that they served Paul as amanuenses in the writing of it. To use a favorite theory and phrase of the critics this postscript must have been the work of some misguided "Redactor."

There is nothing now left for the critic to do but to invent the theory that

the letter was written by some wag, all out of his imagination, and several years after Paul's time, as a sort of April fool's joke upon a credulous Christian church.

Other Considerations Bearing on the Flood

BY PROFESSOR H. W. MAGOUN, PH.D., CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS.

Twelfth paper of a series explaining why a world flood is a scientific necessity, if various geological and other problems are to be met.



DATES in the early history of mankind are proverbially unreliable. Conjecture, based on proper evidence, is therefore necessary in many instances. On such a basis, it is safe to assume that the flood occurred at about 4000 B. C., because evidence of a decided break in the continuity of their rulers and in the continuity of the people themselves before the dawn of reliable history, is not lacking, in more instances than one.

Somewhere in the neighborhood of 4000 B. C. the flood must have occurred, for at about that time all the intricate conditions in which the event is enmeshed appear to be possible of fulfilment. The Chinese tradition may therefore be correct, and the Assyrian records may be right in referring to sacred documents, or rather inscriptions, of a contemporary date.

But if they are right, it is no mere coincidence that the Genesis account of the catastrophe reads like the tale of an eye-witness, since Noah may have kept a record of what took place. Such a record would be religiously preserved for many generations, and it is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that a record of that kind actually came into the hands of Ruel, the priest of Midian, who was a descendant of Abraham, and whose daughter Zipporah became Moses' wife.

Through her the story may have come into his possession and been expanded into its present literary form. More remarkable things have happened, and the truth often makes fiction pale into insignificance.

A word further should be said at this point concerning the climatic changes already discussed in connection with the flood incident, to make sure that all is clear. The submerged areas rose again but never attained their old level. These portions of the continents remained comparatively low, while the corresponding portions of the oceanic islands—those that had suffered volcanic remaking—remained comparatively high. The net result was a higher general sea level and a lower general land level. Continental areas were thus reduced, while sea areas were greatly extended, as already stated.

In connection therewith another element must be considered. In calculating the power of the tidal waves which constituted the main features of the flood, allowance must be made for the molten lava, boiling mud, and superheated steam that were forced into the ocean from beneath, in the course of the cataclysm, as already intimated. Vast quantities of heat, absorbed therefrom, thus became available in melting the floating ice of the destroyed ice cap. A balance was ultimately struck, and climatic conditions were equalized. The results thus obtained have persisted, and man has been the gainer.

It is not to be supposed that these effects took place immediately. Much of the glacial ice was speedily melted beyond doubt; but huge bergs and extensive floes were left, because they were too large to be melted in a short time. Some may have floated for decades before they finally disappeared. Others, on the land, stranded because of their depth, also melted away. In a few decades all had disappeared, and the earth was in possession of the most water it has had since early geological ages. Raised beaches, at least, appear to so indicate.

Now, note this fact. The stranded ice masses thus postulated offer a simple and reasonable explanation for many of the strange and puzzling geological

combinations which have long baffled the ingenuity of scientists in their efforts to explain them. Ice dams seemed to be called for; but ice dams were hard to account for. On the basis laid down they are hard to escape. Wherever the topography of the land could form a channel for the retiring sea, there ice jams became unavoidable as the flood subsided. That they existed is too obvious to be questioned any longer.

They delayed things and affected the climate more or less for years. Backward springs, tardy summers, fields of ice on the inland lakes lasting well into the warm season, ice dams in the fastnesses of the mountains persisting because of the films of silt overlying them, temporary lakes due to these dams, and other incidental results were all direct or indirect outcome of these stranded masses of ice in various extensive areas. Modern conditions did not really prevail until the ice finally disappeared.

Looked at from this point of view, 4000 B. C. again seems like a probable date for the flood. The earth had now shifted its position so that Perihelion and Aphelion were beginning to occupy the months between the winter and summer seasons, and in the Northern Hemisphere, as well as in the Southern, the spring and fall were the seasons most affected. One was shortened somewhat, while the other was lengthened. If the flood occurred under these conditions, they were certainly favorable to an outcome such as must have taken place.

It must occasionally have happened that the dams formed were permanent, because the ice was so clogged with *debris* that its melting did not remove the obstruction. In that category may be placed the old Mississippi and Niagara gorges which now show exactly such conditions. They belong, then, at the close of the Ice Era and just after the flood. The erosion of new channels is therefore a safe basis for calculations concerning the date of the catastrophe.

Many factors enter into the problem, some calling for delay and some for an increase of speed in the rate at which the channels were cut. It certainly was not uniform, because it must have varied with the rainfall and other causes. In each case, however, it is clear that the speed elements have been neglected and that the time allowed is too long. Six thousand years is certainly an ample period for the completed process, and that, again, points to the date 4000 B. C.

It conflicts with the date on the margin of the English Bible, but that is the work of James Usher, a British prelate born in Dublin in 1580. He obtained his results by adding together the ages of the patriarchs at the time each son in the line was born. It seemed to offer results that must be a certainty; but it neglected a vital oriental habit. Attention has been called to it by various writers.

When an oriental says "the son of," he is apt to mean a descendant of the person in question. It is always so in Hebrew, and that is why Christ himself is the "son of David, the son of Abraham." It is also why Matthew (i. 8) can say that Joram begat Uzziah (Ozias), leaving out three generations,—Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah (1 Chron. iii. 11-12). Azariah is, of course, to be identified with Uzziah, and the change of spelling should occasion no difficulty.

They had a habit of selecting the prominent persons in a line and leaving out the rest, and that is what enabled them to produce lines of equal length. What the gaps were no one now knows. We can trace some such omissions. Thus, we have "Shebuel the son of Gershom, the son of Moses." (1 Chron. xxvi. 24), the sons of Moses being given as "Gershom and Eliezer" (1 Chron. xxiii. 15). The next verse (16) adds, as the chief son of Gershom, Shebuel; but Shebuel was appointed over the treasury by David in his old age, and that was some centuries after the time of Moses.

Similarly, in Ezra (vii. 3) Azariah is given as the son of Meraioth, although there were actually six generations between them (1 Chron. vi. 7-11). No dependence, therefore, can be placed on Archbishop Usher's chronology; for it is certainly unreliable, and the date of the flood must be obtained in other ways if it is obtained at all.

Meanwhile, it is well to remember that time has not been limitless, so far as

this world is concerned, and that it will not be. The brief and temporary character of all things mundane must be conceded, and it behooves us, in the light of what has been discovered, to be modest in our estimate of past ages. The flood was accordingly not so remote an event as some would have us believe, nor yet was it so recent as many have taught.

Incidentally, also, it should be said that much of the use of Bible expressions containing the words "son of" is entirely misleading. Thus the Greek for the first verse in Matthew shows clearly that "son of Abraham" refers to Christ and not to David. As it stands in English, it refers to David; but that is unquestionably wrong. The heading indicates that the list contains the genealogy of Jesus, "son of David, son of Abraham." The Greek contains no article, and a more correct rendering would be "Jesus Christ Davidson, descendant of Abraham." That is what is actually meant, in spite of its awkwardness. It illustrates the real content of the Hebrew and Greek idioms.

There is one other thing to be thought of in connection with this matter of the date of the flood. It is the question of population. Suppose that Noah's family of eight doubled itself in thirty-three and a third years, and that this rate remained constant. At the end of a century there would be 2 times 2 times 2' times eight people or 64 in all. A second century would produce 512 persons. A third would end with 4096. This seems very moderate.

Suppose, however, that only twenty years were required. This would mean two more 2's as factors in the first century, and the number would then be 256. In the second there would appear 8192. And at the end of the third we should have 262,144 as the population of the world due to Noah. For that time of the world the figure is not at all unreasonable.

Let us go a little deeper. Prolong the period and make it fifty years. It will then require a century to quadruple the population. At that rate Adam and Eve would have only eight in the family in one hundred years. What would that amount to in a thousand years? The problem means ten factors equaling 4 and a 2 to represent Adam and Eve. Three 4's will give 64. Four will mean 256. Five will produce 1024. This multiplied by itself will give the product of the ten. The result will be 1,048,576, and twice that will equal the population at the end of one thousand years. It is well over two million.

How about two thousand years? That will mean over a million times a million times two or, if we throw away all the significant figures except the 1's and the 2, a million times 2,000,000, or a thousand times 2,000,000,000. Such possibilities, to say nothing of the world's experience during the past five hundred years, should give pause to the men who talk glibly of "eons of time," for past eras and events. "The imagination is a forward delusive faculty, ever obtruding beyond its sphere." It may be well to remember that.

The actual figures are 2,199,023,255,552, if any one cares for details, and it is an easy matter to verify them. When the population doubles once in fifty years, for each two there will be four in fifty years and eight in one hundred. That means that each century will multiply the population four times, if the rate of increase remains constant. Two multiplied by this factor 4 will represent the first century, on that basis, for Adam and Eve. A second 4 will cover the second century and so on up to twenty 4's, which will mean twenty centuries or two thousand years. The process is simple and incontrovertible.

When it is remembered that the population of Russia before the war was increasing at such a rate that it was doubling itself once in twenty-five years and that the Japanese are said to be increasing at the rate of 600,000 a year, the above figures take on a serious character. The fifty year period is evidently conservative enough for purposes of calculation; but its meaning should furnish food for thought. No such rate can possibly be maintained, and no such rate ever has been maintained, because the present population of the earth is but a small fraction of the amount given. It is said to be about 1,600,000,000.

The mortality of the past has been the factor that has prevented disaster, and

it is the only factor that could have done so. Any one who is disposed to question the wisdom or goodness of the Almighty, because He has permitted wars and pestilence in the past, will do well to think things over a little; for to be consistent he must believe that famine and a lingering starvation are a more desirable fate for the majority of mankind than war and pestilence. That is the only alternative, unless the birth rate is checked. It follows that those who postulate a hundred thousand years for man must also postulate a fearful mortality for almost the entire period, since there is no evidence that the world has ever been densely populated until recent centuries. From this angle also the evidence is against the long-period theorists.

That side of the matter may therefore be left and other considerations that bear on the general topic may be taken up for discussion. The inland seas and lakes, in particular, need to have some notice taken of them. It has already been mentioned that large areas of North America were flooded for many years after the disappearance of the ice cap. That point is conceded by all, and its effects are fairly well agreed upon. Like conditions must, however, have obtained elsewhere, notably in Asia, the gradual desiccation of portions of which is reflected in the Vedic literature.

Many of the ancient lake beds in that region have been found to have salt deposits in their bottom, and that fact may be explained by the admixture of sea water due to the deluge, while the influence of the melting ice may be traced in the relative proportions of the salt in the different basins. Concentration gradually led to saline lakes of a smaller size; then came ponds; then, salt marshes; and finally desposits of salt.

The Aral Sea has remained in a condition resembling that of these ancient lakes; but the Caspian seems to have received additional accretions of salt during the high-water stage of the oceans, when it was directly connected with the Mediterranean *via* the Black Sea. Neither the Caspian nor the Black Sea is very saline, and it has been inferred that neither has been enclosed long enough to gather and concentrate a great amount of salt. That is what the Dead Sea and the Great Salt Lake are supposed to have done, with the help of the streams now flowing into them; but that remarkable hypothesis is certainly less believable than another and more simple explanation that will be suggested below.

In the meantime, one other thing may be mentioned in connection with the high water of post-glacial days. The suggestion comes from the *London Times* of Feb. 19, 1909, which calls attention to the remarkable discoveries recently made in Crete. These, it thinks, may point to the lost Atlantis so graphically pictured in Plato's *Timaus*. The story of the priest of Sais, according to which Athens conquered Atlantis only to be overwhelmed with it in the sea, might thus contain elements of truth, since ancient ideas concerning the location of the Pillars of Hercules may have been rather nebulous. On any such basis, however, the period between the flood and the final disappearance of the ice must be prolonged beyond reasonable bounds, to allow for the required increase in population, and a dilemma immediately results. It may serve to counterbalance the things that favor the idea, as some things certainly do.

An important factor in the general problem of the inland seas and lakes is that remarkable body of water known as Lake Baikal. It shows signs of some recent great upheaval, or some mighty earth movement, such as has been postulated as one of the incidents of the flood. Its enormous chasm may, in fact, have been affected in some way at the time of that event; and, if it was, its astonishing depth may be due to some readjustment of land surfaces which allowed its bottom to sink below its ancient level. Any glacial *debris* that may have existed in that forbidding region may thus have been disposed of permanently, leaving no traces behind it, although ancient glaciers for the locality are doubtful.

The Dead Sea, so far as its genesis is concerned, resembled Lake Baikal, although glacial elements can be definitely excluded. It lies in an earthquake region which has suffered extensively in the past, and it occupies the lowest part

of a great cleft, a thousand miles or more in length, which is plainly the result of some convulsion of nature. Its greatest depth is about thirteen hundred feet, while the greatest depth of Lake Baikal is more than four thousand; but its area is small compared with Lake Baikal's four hundred miles of length and thirty miles of width.

On neither has the silt of modern ages made any apparent impression; and either their original depth must have been excessive or else they occupy clefts which are geologically very recent. As was implied above, this may point to alterations in them at the time of the flood, and it may also indicate that that event was not one that is remote. Their formation appears to be decidedly recent.

Lake Baikal has an outlet to the sea, and its waters are fresh. The Dead Sea, on the other hand, is land-locked and exceedingly salt. It seems likely that this condition is in part the result of a gradual concentration of the vast quantities of salt water that must have been left by the flood in the great cleft of which the Dead Sea is a part; for there are clear evidences that it was once filled to the brim. That fact is another element in the problem.

If the Dead Sea actually is the residuum of such inheritance from the deluge, its saline character is not hard to understand, and the salt bluffs on its southwestern shore, as at present regarded, seem somewhat less remarkable. On any other basis, the presence of so much salt, supposedly crystalized out of the sea itself, is not easy of comprehension, *provided it really did come from the sea.*

Some salt has undoubtedly been contributed by drainage, but the proportion must be exceedingly small and hardly worth considering, unless natural salt deposits not due to the presence of sea water have added their quota to the sum total through some agency in the past. The salt impregnated sands of the shores are not to be overlooked, and they seem to point in the direction of former enlarged areas of salt water that was later concentrated.

There is a theory that the ocean owes its saltness to the rivers which have brought down salt to it by their waters; but that theory overlooks various possibilities. Ocean areas far exceed those of the land, and the rivers cover but an insignificant fraction of the earth's surface. If they can find salt to carry into the sea, is it reasonable to suppose that the ocean, with all its vast extent, can find none? To suppose that it cannot seems absurd.

Mines of rock salt, hard enough to permit beautiful grottoes to be carved out of the salt itself, are found in Europe, and other salt mines occur elsewhere. It is therefore hardly to be supposed that the ocean floor escaped all such formations. But if it did not, the river theory falls to the ground. So does the absurd notion that the ocean began as fresh water. It began as hot water; but wherever sodium chloride came into existence in forming the earth's crust, there any contact with hot water, be it rain or running stream or stagnant pool, or the sea itself, meant a saline solution.

Condensation after saturation meant crystalization, and many of the present salt formations undoubtedly had such an origin; but at the beginning of things, at the time when chemical compounds were just coming into existence, it is evident that some other process must have been available. Otherwise there would have been no salt.

It is accordingly safe to infer that the ocean, on the basis of comparative opportunity, is not indebted to the rivers for its salt. The chances are thousands to one against such a contingency, and the ocean has probably been in contact with salt, either formed or forming, from the start; for salt, as a chemical compound, must have occurred in the very beginning.

On this basis, the salt bluffs to the southwest of the Dead Sea may have furnished the source of supply for much of its salinity instead of being derived from its waters. If they were there before the flood, the sand and gravel overlying them may go back in part to that event and not be entirely the result of excessive rains, as is commonly supposed. Certain it is that the peculiarities and the limitations of the salt formations, as they now appear, constitute a most serious obstacle to the acceptance of the theory that they came from the waters of the sea itself.

What might reasonably be expected to take place can be seen from a study of our own Great Salt Lake, which appears to be but the impounded dregs of the huge tidal wave that overwhelmed the plains from the south, filling the basis of the Salton Sea and covering everything but the mountains with water. There could have been no admixture of ice until the northern limits of the plains were reached. When it was encountered, the tidal waves were freshened more or less extensively.

At the close of the disturbance an immense body of water was left, with a shore line nearly a thousand feet above the present level of Great Salt Lake. It included Lake Sevier, which is also salt. Fresh water shells are found on this shore line; but the water may have been somewhat brackish for all that. It would thus be sufficiently saline to account for the present character of the lake, which is decidedly salt. It should be noted that layers of salt crystalizing out in shallow places, as the lake shrank, would gradually be washed into it again by the drainage due to heavy rainstorms, and the same thing is true of the Dead Sea, where the phenomenon can still be observed.

It may not be without significance that a salt mine in Southern Louisiana, discovered in 1861, beneath a drift mass sixteen feet or more in depth, was found to contain fossil remains of human beings, mastodons, mammoths, etc., together with pottery and stone implements. A common catastrophe seems to have overwhelmed men and animals alike in this instance as in others. Was it the flood? The appearance of things would so indicate.

In studying all of these matters, nothing, perhaps, is more conspicuous than the constant omission of important factors,—unless it is the general neglect of possible correlations in mundane phenomena. Things do not happen as isolated events in this world; for they are all connected in such a way that they constitute a united whole, the various parts being duly related to one another. The theory of relativity is fully justified in that much of its application, regardless of any vagaries it may display in other respects. The relations of things to one another have been sadly neglected by scientists, and the fault should be corrected.

Overhasty generalization also has been altogether too common—it is difficult to avoid it entirely in dealing with such complex matters,—and improvement in such connections is in order. Take, for example, the erosion of the Mississippi mentioned above. From 1680 to 1766 the rate was a trifle less than five feet, while from 1766 to 1856 it was almost exactly six and two-thirds feet. The inference that the rate has been more rapid in recent centuries than it was at the beginning is practically certain to be made, on the basis of such figures alone, regardless of the width of the gorge, the rainfall, and the peculiarities of bedrock, all of which must be taken into consideration.

At Niagara the last factor certainly delayed things, and that is why only a thousand years was allowed for the increased speed due to the narrowness of the ancient falls. It was largely offset by the amount of rock to be eroded in cutting down to the present grade. More had to be cut away below than above the whirlpool, owing to the slant of the strata, and only a part of the work has been done by grinding in the channel itself. That is still going on, but loose rocks left by the fall in its retreat are large enough to protect the bottom to a considerable extent, and that factor must be allowed for along with the rest. It accounts, in part, for the character of the rapids.

The rock formations in the two gorges are surprisingly alike in their general nature. Each has a hard layer at the top, that in the Mississippi being of thin limestone. Then a soft stratum follows, below which is another hard layer. In the Mississippi this is a shell limestone. Soft rock is then encountered in each case, the Mississippi having sandstone. At Niagara another hard layer is then encountered, while in the Mississippi a soft greenish stone is found similar to the second layer. It needs no argument to show that the soft strata are the ones which erode most easily.

Now, the Mississippi sandstone varies in thickness to such an extent that it has been estimated at from ten feet to fifty or seventy-five. The bluffs are ap-

proximately one hundred feet high, and the drop in the stream ranges from fifty to about one hundred. The part played by that varying sandstone is not yet known, but it is a vital element in the problem. In other words, the factors are not constant, and the erosion must necessarily have been variable. A difference in width or in hardness of strata, or both, must accordingly be considered before it is safe to form an opinion concerning the rate, and the lack of exact details makes it necessary to suspend judgment in the matter. Without such details estimates are largely guess-work and of no particular value.

Relativity is always a part of the problem. North America appears to have been a thousand feet higher during the Ice Age than it is at present; but that means its relation to tide-water, not its distance from the center of the earth. Its actual elevation was less than that, the depression of the sea making up the difference. The thousand feet was composed of two elements, and neither can be ignored. The second was placed tentatively at 80 feet, with a possible increase to 1000, at the end of the Ice Age. It is impossible to give the exact figures, and conjecture must supplement calculation.

Incidentally, the Persian Gulf would be drained, the excessive heat of modern Mesopotamia would be eliminated, and a fertile plain with a delightful climate would occupy what is now the Persian Gulf. The Garden of Eden may have included that plain. It was watered by one river with four heads, and the conditions named would fit the description. The name Euphrates has survived.

With the high water that followed the flood, the country was largely covered, and the Tigris and Euphrates could thus enter the Persian Gulf by separate mouths. That condition prevailed up to what may now be called historic times, and Ur of the Chaldees, whose supposed situation is located some one hundred and fifty miles inland, is said to have been a maritime city with harbor and docks at the time of Abram's departure, which is commonly placed at about 2150 B. C. Silting up accounts for the change in part; but, unless the land has also been raised, which is a remote contingency, the ocean must have been lowered with the passing ages. It has already been claimed that it was lowered and that the raised beaches in different parts of the world so indicate.

Changes of ocean level have certainly occurred, and there has been a reason for them. But if the causes that were operative during the Quaternary Period have been correctly outlined, the beginning of present high water conditions can hardly be placed earlier than, perhaps, two thousand years before Abraham's day. The margin thus allowed appears to be ample, and concessions in one direction can be made as well as in the other, if any are needed. That leaves the flood at 4000 B. C. in accordance with the conclusions already reached.

Excavations at Nippur have disclosed extensive accumulations of *debris* antedating Sargon I., whose date is commonly given as 3800 B. C. They may have been mostly a by-product of the flood. If so, they are significant.

Much remains to be learned concerning the deluge; but it is becoming more and more clear that a world-wide catastrophe lies back of Noah's story. His tale, despite its strange incidents and apparent defiance of natural law, is an accurate and vivid portrayal of actual events. No man would imagine such happenings without some experience to suggest them, and men do not insert such details into a sober narrative, unless the truth demands it. Noah told things as they actually happened—to him.

His description, then, implies rather than relates what happened in a universal flood. Noah told what he saw. He knew nothing of the world as such. He had no need to know anything, and his people after him had none. We must remember that and not read into the Bible record our own modern ideas. We do that sort of thing too often and then save our faces by falling back on revelation. It is no more praiseworthy than the critical habit of falling back on what is rational. Each is special pleading, whether we realize it or not.

The antediluvian Brontosaurus resembled a cross between an elephant and a sea serpent. A geologist would recognize his bones for what they are; but no man not a geologist could do so. He might indeed describe them so that a geologist would know what he had seen; but he could not go further than that. In

some such way Noah has described the flood. Moses has transmitted the description. Neither of them understood what it was really like. Both were helped to be accurate. We reap the benefit. In this way, revelation is made progressive, and God's wisdom is justified. His Word fits every age and clime and every condition that is found among men. That proves it is inspired.

The CHAMPION is the minister's companion as well. I devour every word each month. Have studied higher criticism but cannot swallow their doctrine. I cling to the old faith.—Rev. J. A. Betcher, Ph.D.

The Book of Proverbs

BY WILLIAM H. BATES, D.D., GREELEY, COLORADO.



ICERO has said, "Proverbs are the salt-pits of a nation, treasured preservatives against corruption." Says Earl Russell, "A proverb is the wisdom of many in the wit of one." Tennyson has called

"Jewels five words long
That on the stretched forefinger of all time
Sparkle forever."

Says Howard Crosby, "A proverb is a sentence of condensed wisdom," and "embodies the philosophy of the people in distinction from that of the philosophers."

All nations have their proverbs, and it is claimed by scholars that the nationality of a proverb is quite as distinguishable by its peculiarities as is the coin of a nation. It is reckoned that as many as 20,000 of these pithy sayings have been collected from the different nations and published. But Dean Stanley has pointed out that the Solomonic proverbs differ from others in that while the others are national, his are individual. His are a gift to the people, instead of being a product of the people.

As David was the originator of the psalm-literature, so Solomon was the originator of the proverbial literature, neither having, so far as we know, any models before them after which to copy. Homer stands at the head of all secular literature; yet Solomon lived 200 years before Homer's time. When we speak of the Seven Wise Men of Greece, we seem to be getting back to a very hazy antiquity; yet 700 years before they uttered their maxims, Solomon spoke in proverbs. Six hundred years before Socrates, Plato and Aristotle gave the world their philosophy, Solomon gave the world God's philosophy, heaven's laws for life on earth. Solomon's proverbs, instead of being a minted form of the people's wisdom, are the product of that wisdom with which God endowed him individually in response to his wise choice when God appeared to him, in the beginning of his career, at Gibeon. Said God: "Behold, I have done according to thy word: lo, I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee" (I Kings iii. 12).

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE BOOK

The Book of Proverbs, as it stands, is only in part of Solomonic origin, and what we have from him is only a small part of what he wrote. The book has thirty-one chapters, and of these only the first twenty-four were probably prepared by him. About 300 years later, in King Hezekiah's time, some learned and pious men of that day made a collection from then extant Solomonic writings or writings of Solomonic character, which have since disappeared; and this collection begins at chapter xxv.

It is said in I Kings iv. 32, that Solomon spake 3,000 proverbs, and his songs were 1,005. An account of his scientific writings is also given. But of his 1,005 songs, only two Psalms (72 and 127)—possibly two more (2 and 45)—and the Canticles have come down to us. Of his 3,000 proverbs, only about 750

in the book are ascribed to him. Of the authorship of the rest of the book, we have no means of knowing farther than what is stated in the book itself, particularly in the last two chapters.

THE FORM OF THE BOOK

In our authorized English translation from the Hebrew, the fact fails to appear that the proverbs are poetry; but the Revision puts them in proper poetic form. Says a writer: "Poetry is the speech of a people's childhood." If this be so, then in the very form of the Solomonic proverbs we have proof of their ancient origin. The common proverbs are prose, and belong to a later period; and they are, for the most part, a single terse statement.

Take, for example, the following concerning love. English: "Love is blind." Spanish: "People in love think other people's eyes are out." Dutch: "Nobody's sweetheart is ugly." Welsh: "Faults are thick where love is thin." Spanish again: "To love and to be wise is impossible." Italian: "Love is master of all arts." French: "Love subdues all but the ruffian's heart."

The Solomonic proverbs, on the other hand, are very seldom in a single statement, but are for the most part in a double statement,—two lines of poetry, though occasionally there are more. This form is what writers on prosody call a *distich*, i. e. two poetic verses, or lines. By this parallelism, one line stands related to the other in the way of difference or resemblance, of contrast or comparison, or it may be of iteration, i. e. the thought stated in one line is expressed in the other in different language.

Take for example this comparative distich:

"Where there is no wood the fire goeth out;
So where there is no talebearer contention ceases." (xxvi. 20).

Or this:

"As a jewel in a swine's snout,
So is a fair woman without discretion." (xi. 22).

Take these, in which one line is in contrast or in opposition to the other:

"Whoso loveth instruction loveth knowledge;
But he that hateth reproof is brutish." (xii. 1).

"The lip of truth shall be established forever;
But the tongue of falsehood is but for a moment." (xii. 19).

"A fool uttereth all his mind;
But a wise man keepeth it in till afterward." (xxix. 11).

Take these in which truth is reiterated, the thought expressed in one line continued in the next in different form:

"The liberal soul shall be made fat;
And he that watereth shall be watered also himself." (xi. 25).

"The rich ruleth over the poor;
And the borrower is the servant of the lender." (xxii. 7).

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom;
And the knowledge of the Holy one is understanding." (ix. 10).

The proverbs are mainly in this distich form, though there are instances of four (xxiii. 23, 24) or even six (xxiii. 1-3) lines.

THE CONTENTS OF THE BOOK

The whole may be divided into four books:

Book I. For the Young. Chaps. I-IX.

Introduction, i. 1-6. Motto, i. 7.

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge,
But fools despise wisdom and instruction."

1st. Admonitory discourse, i. 8, iii. 35.

2nd. Admonitory discourse, iv. 1, vii. 27.

3rd. Admonitory discourse, viii. 1, ix. 18.

Book II. For All Ages and Ranks. Chaps. X-XXIV.

Book III. The Hezekiah Collection. Chaps. XXV-XXIX.

Book IV. Appendices. Chaps. XXX-XXXI.

1. The Words of Agur, xxx. 1-33.

2. The Words of King Lemuel, xxxi. 1-31.

(1) Maxims for Kings, xxxi. 1-9.

(2) The Golden A B C for Wives, xxxi. 10-31.

THE SCOPE AND DESIGN OF THE BOOK

The Scope of the Book covers this earthly life, and has little, if anything, to do with the hereafter; and its Design is to teach us how to live here.

It is well placed after the Psalms. The Psalms are devotional: the Proverbs are practical. The Psalms feed and stimulate the heart: the Proverbs point out the way we should take.

This Book does not deal with the salvation of the sinner, any more than does the Sermon on the Mount. It has nothing to say about redemption, or justification, or sanctification. It has to do with our walk on earth, teaching us principles of heavenly wisdom therefor, and warning us not to play the fool. But let the life which the Book of Proverbs or the Sermon on the Mount be contemplated, and it will be found to be impossible except one comes into that relation to God which is salvation.

Generalizing somewhat largely, it might be said that the book seems to regard the sins of men as growing out of untruthfulness, dishonesty, covetousness, hatred, sloth, unchastity, and intemperance—or perhaps all might be summed up in the one word *disobedience*, i. e. to the dictates of Wisdom; and it therefore comes out strong against these vices and inculcates those virtues which are their opposite. Illustration by reference or quotation space forbids.

Says Dr. Guthrie: "The day was in Scotland, when all her children were initiated into the art of reading through the Book of Proverbs. I have no doubt whatever (neither had the late Principal Lee, as appears by the evidence he gave before a committee of parliament) that the high character which Scotsmen earned in bygone years was mainly due to their early acquaintance with the Book of Proverbs—the practical sagacity and wisdom of Solomon. The book has unfortunately disappeared from our schools"—a lesson and warning that well may we in America heed who care for the wellbeing of the young—"and with its disappearance my countrymen are more and more losing their national virtues, in self-denial and self-reliance, in foresight and economy, in reverence of parents and abhorrence of public charity, some of the best characteristics of old manners and old times."

That was a wise thing which a Christian woman did in Binghamton, N. Y., when she gave to all the boys above the infant department and all the young men of the Bible classes in the First Presbyterian Sunday School a neat, serviceable pocket edition of the Book of Proverbs.

Its scope takes in not only individual but state welfare. Says Coleridge: "The Book of Proverbs is the best statesman's manual that was ever written. An adherence to the political economy and spirit of that collection of apothegms and essays would do more to eradicate from a people the causes of extravagance, debasement and ruin, than all the contributions of Say, Smith, Malthus and Chalmers together."

THE PRINCIPAL BY WHICH THE DESIGN OF THE BOOK IS ACCOMPLISHED

We have it in one word—*Wisdom*. Wisdom is the principle which lies at the beginning and is the foundation of all true righteousness and goodness, and by obedience to it the design of the Book—the securing of a right life—is accomplished.

It is a strange law of thought, which all recognize when attention is called to it, viz, that to every principle the mind predicates its opposite. For instance, we cannot think of light without the mind instantly associating with it the opposite principle of darkness. Over against the conception of righteousness the mind at once places the concept of sin. Wisdom—folly. Wisdom would secure a right life; folly would prevent it. So all through the Book, Wisdom is ac-

accompanied by its opposite principle, Folly. Indeed the words wisdom—folly, wise man—fool, or their synonyms, could be written all over it. Its motto, or text, as we have seen, is

“The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge,
But fools despise wisdom and instruction.”

And the Book sticks to its text with a persistence that would astonish the modern preacher if he should examine it from that point of view. A dividing line runs right through the whole, and every antithetic distich falls apart into two halves, one-half going on one side of the line in the domain of wisdom, and the other half going on the other side of the line in the domain of folly.

“The wise shall inherit glory;
But shame is the promotion of fools” (iii. 35).

“The wise in heart shall receive commandments;
But the prating fool shall fall” (x. 8).

I have taken some pains to count up, and I find that the words wisdom, wise, or wisely, are used in 121 different passages, and that the words folly, fool, foolish, or foolishness, appear in 95 different passages, and that these opposed words, either by implication or by their synonyms, are in most of the other passages.

And in the Solomonic writings the fool is an exceedingly variegated person. There is the fool pure and simple, the embodiment of folly; then there is the self-confident fool, and the empty fool, and the thick-headed fool, and the silly fool. Nor is the Solomonic idea of a fool the same as with us—one deficient in intellect: he is, the rather, one who is deficient morally, one who is destitute of the wisdom which begins in and grows out of the fear of the Lord. Consequently all men—ourselves—are distributed into one or the other of these two classes, wise men or fools. Which?

What is that Wisdom which is the great principle of this Book?

A critical study of the Hebrew word translated wisdom, *chokmah*, and its use in the Solomonic writings, has yielded this: “It denotes insight into that upright dealing which pleases God and conforms to the divine law,—a knowledge of the right way which is to be followed before God, and of the wrong way which is to be shunned. In short, it is that practical uprightness, founded on religious enlightenment, in which the true happiness of man consists.” (Lange’s Com., Introd., p. 7).

Thus we see that the wisdom in the Book of Proverbs which is for our practical guidance in the affairs of this world is essentially *religious*. And rightly is it so. For, we have, first, God the Creator; then, secondly, creation; then, thirdly, naturally and necessarily a law from Him that underlies and overlays, and permeates all through creation. Now, it stands to reason that the well-being of creation, as a whole or in any of its parts, must be found in being in harmony with the law of the Creator, and that the moment any part gets out of harmony with, goes athwart or, in a word *disobeys*, that law, only ill can result. Religion is the binding of the soul back to God, or, simply, *obedience to Him*. The wisdom, then, which teaches us how to rightly conduct ourselves with reference to Him and the system of things which exists, must be essentially religious.

The question follows, How is that Wisdom obtained?

It begins in that state of mind and heart indicated by the words, “The fear of the Lord.” Not a dread of God, but a reverential awe and love of Him which leads to filial obedience. Submitting the heart to Him with a purpose of obedience, He imparts that “wisdom which is from above, that is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits” (Jas. iii. 17). Truly may Wisdom say, “Whoso findeth Me findeth life, and shall obtain favor of the Lord” (viii. 35).

One great lesson which this Book teaches, and which obviously follows from what has just been said is this: *Religion is the basis of right conduct, or rather that conduct, to be right, must be religious.*

How the Book does discriminate all men into one of two classes! On one side of the dividing line are the wise, the pious, the religious, and on the other side are all the rest. This cuts off the moralist root and branch. Religion, as we have seen is simply obedience to God. What is Morality? The word is derived from the Latin *mos, moris*, manner, custom. Morality is obedience to custom. And here is just the difference between a moral and a religious man. The one conducts himself in obedience to God; the other, doing maybe the very same things, will conduct himself in accordance with the manner or custom of the time and place, will act in obedience to the ethical code that prevails, where he is or in accordance with his moral education. Religion says, "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart," "in all thy ways acknowledge Him" (iii. 5, 6). The moral man does not do that, for if he did he would be a religious man. Religion includes morality, but the morality of the mere moralist excludes religion. (See this subject treated at length in the sermon, "Religion vs. Morality," BIBLE CHAMPION, August-September, 1921, p. 335.) The beginning of wisdom, the continuance of wisdom, the growth of wisdom, is in the fear of the Lord. Conduct to be right must be religious.

Allow me to express my high appreciation of your BIBLE CHAMPION. For ability, learning, piety, and fidelity to revealed Truth, it stands supreme.
—Rev. Alexander Hardie.

The Bible—All or Part?

BY THE REV. ALBERT L. COPELAND, A.B., PAOLI, INDIANA



ACH of the most widely accepted religions has its books. Confucianism has its sayings of Confucius; Hinduism has the sacred books of India's sages; Mohammedanism, its Koran; Judaism, its Old Testament and the writings of the men schooled in the Hebrew religion; Eddyism, its Science and Health; Mormonism, its Book of Mormon; and Christianity, its Holy Bible.

Each devotee to any of the above religions has faith in the writings which are the foundations of his creed. When a Mohammedan loses faith in the Koran, Islam loses a follower. When a Buddhist loses faith in the crystallized wisdom of Buddha, then Buddha loses a disciple. When a follower of Mrs. Eddy's science discerns the fallacies of her text book, then Eddyism loses a propagandist. When a Christian begins to doubt, to allege error in and to set aside any portion of Holy Writ, then a Christian begins to lose his faith and Christianity begins to lose a defender. If unquestioning acceptance of the inspiration and authority of the Koran produces the most devout type of Mohammedans, how can questioning the historicity, plenary inspiration and authority of the Holy Bible produce a high type of a Christian? If a doubter of the alleged revelations to Joseph Smith wins no converts to Mormonism, can we expect one who doubts God's revelation to, and unique inspiration of the writers of the Holy Scriptures, declared to be the words of God, endorsed by Jesus the Christ and held to be true by His apostles, and verified by the witness of the Holy Spirit who breathed upon the writers, to be fully alive to the need of men's salvation through the Lord Jesus Christ, very God and very man and only Saviour?

The Bible is unique. No other Book compiled from the works of many writers has the unity shown in the Bible. It is a book of many pens and many centuries but one purpose runs through it all. It plays upon the entire keyboard of the human intellect and emotions. It discovers the lowest acts and basest motives of our souls. It leads us upward until with inspired vision we see the infinite holiness and justice of the God of all the earth. It searches the inmost recesses of depraved hearts and reveals the double cure for sin and uncleanness in the blood of the Lamb of God. It begins with the beginning of things and back of that beginning shows us the Omnipotent Self-Existent One with His Eternal Son and blessed Spirit planning the redemption of sinful

man. The Bible—many books by many men—has divine unity from first to last and in that one message God reveals to man a man's own heart and also reveals God saving and redeeming man through Son and Spirit.

The Bible stands or falls as a whole. It is a finished work. It is not to be added to or to suffer loss by man's subtraction. As God's book it must be as perfect as God's other works. Since men have accepted God's works as His even though His works could not all be understood or explained, why should men not accept God's words even though they are not all understood?

God's works and words are by the same Author and one cannot contradict the other. God's works reveal to men the power of God while His words reveal the holiness of the character of God. In the presence of God's words man feels his sinfulness. For centuries man has rebelled less at the discovery of his littleness than at the discovery of his sin. It is for this reason that man has accepted the works of God because they are unavoidable, but has sought to reject, nullify and change the words of God because they make him conscious of sin, unholiness and a fear of judgment.

The Bible has long been the target of the missiles of unbelief. The Book of Books has been ridiculed, scorned, laughed at, disbelieved, misrepresented and misinterpreted. It has had its revelation denied and proclaimed as the product of minds more or less distorted. Its miracles have been set aside as incredible. Its history has been declared to be full of error while hieroglyphics and cuneiform inscriptions have not been discounted. The record of creation is branded as unscientific and obsolete, an attempt of primitive minds to account for the existence of things and life. Adam and Eve are impossible persons. The advent of sin, if the reality of sin be admitted, was entirely different from the record in Genesis. The history of the flood is a myth common to many lands and many peoples, but we are not told why such a story was invented. Abraham must step aside from his place as the friend of God and father of the faithful for it is very doubtful whether he was a real man or not. "And Enoch was not" for the long lived patriarchs are mere inventions. The pillar of fire was a pan of coals carried on a pole before the host of Israel. The miracles assigned to the times of Elijah and Elisha are stories developed from events not at all miraculous. Isaiah was only half or a mere fraction of the man he is supposed to be as his alleged works are largely those of other men. The great fish that swallowed Jonah was a ship that picked him up. Joseph was betrothed to Mary and begat the child Jesus before their actual marriage. Jesus was no different from other men before the incident at Jordan. Jesus shared in the errors of His times, was mistaken in His science, theology and eschatology. Matthew and Luke were parties to a concerted move to give the Nazarene's sect a showing of divine authority by recording a story of a virgin birth and incarnation. We may believe in the divinity of Jesus without accepting His Deity. The gospel writers give irreconcilable accounts of the same events—therefore some one or all must be in error. Paul's theology does not harmonize with Jesus' theology. The Apocalypse teaches something but no one knows what. In all, the Bible is a very human book, and it is to be criticised, cudgelled and cut up in any way that philosophy pleases, theology thinks, science says, unbelief urges, infidelity indicates or scepticism suggests.

It is held by many that the Bible is not a book of science or history but a book of religion, that its teachings in religion may be accepted as true while its portions touching science and history may be rejected as crude and primitive. How can a book be Divinely inspired to teach true religion by means of historical and scientific untruths? The plea that the Bible is solely a "book of religion" will logically lead to a view that it is not Divinely inspired in its religious teachings and is not final authority in religion and morals because its moral and religious teachings are inseparably united with and woven into its teachings on the origin of things and men which is science, and its records of the doings of men including the origin of sin, which is history. Aesop's fables present moral teachings by the relation of stories which make no claim to

scientific or historical value. We accept their morals because there is no falsity of claim to make them immoral. The Bible claims its teachings, scientific, historical, moral and spiritual are inspired of God through the Holy Spirit. If we allow the claim for the last two teachings we must allow it for the first two. If we hold the claim for plenary inspiration of Bible science and history as invalid we may with perfect consistency reject the Divine inspiration of Bible morals and religion, and men will not be slow to seize the opportunity to go into unbelief and take refuge under the right to believe or reject at their pleasure.

Does the Bible stand or fall as a whole? We declare it does. To deny the truth of the first chapters of Genesis throws one back to philosophy and science to account for the origin of matter and life. If the Bible account is mistaken as to how God made the world and man why may it not be mistaken in alleging that God made them? If there was no such man as Adam then sin did not come upon man as related, and perhaps since sin did not come that way it did not come at all, and in this view Darwinism and Eddyism agree. Paul was in gross error when he says in I Cor. 15:22, "In Adam all die," for in this verse and others in the same chapter he writes of Adam as a historical character with as much certainty as he names Jesus of Nazareth, the second Adam, as a historical character. Remember also that Paul claimed he received his gospel by revelation. If he was right when preaching Jesus as Saviour from sin why was he not right in proclaiming Adam as the one through whom sin entered the race?

It is a saying long respected and observed in legal procedure when the credibility of a witness is the issue, "False in one, false in all." If a witness is proven to have deliberately falsified in one item of his testimony his entire testimony is invalidated. If Paul received the gospel by revelation then his teachings must be assumed to represent the revelation correctly or his writings must be assumed to misrepresent that revelation which view will place Paul in the list of willful prevaricators. Therefore his allusions to Adam which assume the historicity of the Genesis account of the fall are in accord with revelation or are not. If they are not Paul is made a liar. If in accord with the revelation given him then there was a man Adam or revelation is wrong. If revelation is wrong we are introduced to a Supreme Being Who does not know what He did or how He did it, or is unable to make Himself understood to His created subjects. To deny the inspiration of Paul in this one statement is to challenge the inspiration and accuracy of all the Pauline epistles.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, Abel, Cain, Enoch, Noah and the deluge are accepted as historic persons and events. If they are not such then it may safely be held that there is nothing in the epistle which necessarily binds one's conscience in morals and religion.

Matthew and Luke record certain events which explain the Virgin birth. John assumes throughout his writings the pre-existence of the Eternal Son Who "became flesh and tabernacled among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." No one can with any fairness show that John did not accept the incarnation as related by Matthew and Luke. Mark's words, "Jesus Christ, the Son of God," can consistently mean but one thing, and that is that Jesus was begotten of God, and throughout Mark's gospel the Deity of Jesus is shown in the claims, words and works of Jesus.

The gospels all record words of Jesus, supported and attested by His miracles, which combine to present Him as the God-man, both Deity and human, eternally existent and temporarily incarnated through the process of the Virgin birth. Either Jesus was all this or he was a most consummate blasphemer and liar.

The Bible stands or falls as a whole. To deny its often repeated "Thus saith the Lord," and "God said," and "The word of the Lord came unto me," is to deny its plenary inspiration. For one man under the guise of scholarship to reject the historicity of various passages of Holy Writ is to invalidate the historicity of the whole book. To deny the credibility of miracles is to assume

the infallibility of human reason. To deny the accuracy of passages to which modern science takes exception is to assume that greater truth is attainable by research than by revelation. To assert Jesus endorsed the Old Testament because He shared in the errors of His times is to deny His Deity and throw Him into the ranks of human founders of new religions. To deny the fall of man and resulting depravity of heart to all Adam's posterity—"for all have sinned"—is to deny the need of regeneration of men's hearts and a vicarious and substitutionary atonement to make regeneration and salvation possible. To deny that the Law with its prescribed sacrifices was a revelation from God and to deny the many passages of predictive prophecy is to put a lie into the mouth of the Lord Jesus Christ, and if He be untruthful to whom shall we go?

The world is dying Christless and unbelieving. Belief in Jesus as Christ, Lord and God is the one remedy for the world's soul sickness. Modern criticism offers great inducements for each man for himself to accept or reject as much or as little of the Bible as he pleases. The denial of part of the Bible will surely lead to doubts about the whole of the Book of Books, and believing nations will gradually but inevitably leave their faith in revelation and usher in the age of reason.

The Character of Washington

BY EDWIN WHITTIER CASWELL, D.D. MIDDLETOWN, DELAWARE.



R. Henry Van Dyke, in an address comparing the characters of Washington and Lincoln said: "They hitched their wagons to the same star. It was Washington who saw most clearly the vital necessity of the Union, and who did most to make it firm and durable. It was Lincoln who met the dangers which Washington had predicted would assail the Union and who saved it from them, and who made it indissoluble. It was Washington who saw the inconsistency, the shame, and the peril of slavery. It was Lincoln who ended it. Washington was a soldier, who fought for the supremacy of just and peaceful laws. Lincoln was a lawyer, who invoked the sword to defend a supreme equity. Both men were too great for personal jealousy, too noble for personal revenge, too simple for personal affectation, whether of roughness or of smoothness, too sincere for personal concealment. Both believed in the nation's dependence upon Almighty God. They were not skeptics; they were believers. They were not clever cynics; they were sober enthusiasts."

Washington, unlike Lincoln, was a silent man. Many of those nearest to him considered him cold, austere and aristocratic. While in this regard he probably was constitutionally different from Lincoln, yet we must remember

that he was absorbed in the greatness of his work, and, like Grant, in the presence of armies that were to settle the destiny of the Revolution, perhaps, in a single battle, he seemed to have the silent loneliness of genius, rather than confiding in the affections and sympathies of his fellows.

After victory had crowned the mighty struggle of seven years' war, Washington's great heart opened to his countrymen. He then wrote to a friend: "The scene is at last closed. I feel myself eased of the load of public care. I hope to spend the remainder of my days in cultivating the affections of good men and in the practice of the domestic virtues." Another touching scene reveals the warmth and tenderness of Washington's inner nature. It was on December 4th, 1781, when the mighty British nation had acknowledged defeat and peace had been declared that Washington took his final farewell to the officers of the army. It was then that the deeps of his soul were so moved and the stream of affection was poured forth. Mr. Lodge says: "As, lifting his glass, he pledged those present, his voice faltered. The toast was drunk in silence. Then he spoke: 'I cannot come to each of you,' he said, 'and take my leave, but shall be obliged if you will come and shake me by the hand.' One by one they approached, and Washington grasped the hand of each man and embraced him. His eyes

were full of tears and he could not trust himself to speak. In silence he bade each and all farewell, and then, accompanied by his officers, walked to Whitehall Ferry."

NO EASE FOR THE LEADER

But Washington's retirement and rest was not to be. He was called to enter upon eight year's more of generalship and toil in endeavoring to crystallize the thirteen separate colonies into a sovereign nation. Once more he gave himself to his country and led the hosts of freedom in the work of laying the foundations of the greatest Republic of the world.

His supreme difficulty was found in the variety of views of religion, government and education existing in the several colonies. There were Puritans, aristocrats, Quakers and Cavaliers and Tories, Federalists and Republicans. He was able, by his great statesmanship and wonderful ability, to harmonize these sectional and factional interests until they became united in one nation.

When Washington recommended a uniform currency, the Federal and Republican parties came into being, the one favoring and the other opposing a National Bank. Jefferson opposed the bank because it would become a competitor with State banks. Hamilton, the leader of the Federalists, favored Washington's recommendation, affirming that there were implied powers in the Constitution as well as the definitely expressed powers. Hamilton and Jefferson being both in the Cabinet, Washington suffered great distress of mind because of the rivalry and sharp differences existing between these two leading men.

At this time one of the foulest and most vicious of pamphlets was issued, attacking Washington, and, just at that time, Jefferson resigned his office of Secretary of State. He gave as a reason that he believed Hamilton to be a Monarchist. Washington said to Jefferson that he did not believe there were ten men in the United States whose opinions

were worth attention who entertained such a thought.

THE OPPOSITION OF JEFFERSON

Sixteen years after the death of Washington Jefferson wrote, speaking of Washington: "His memory was already sensibly impaired by age. He had a willingness to let others act and think for him, over which, in devotion to his imperishable fame, we must forever weep, because of his mental decay." No one now considers Washington a weakling, or that he ever needed sympathy on account of his feeble mentality. Jefferson sought to justify his opposition to Washington and Hamilton in this way, but he only soiled his own name by so doing.

Washington took the ground that the States had surrendered some portion of their original sovereignty under the Federation, in order to form the Union. He saw clearly the idea of a general welfare, as well as a special or domestic welfare. The general welfare sought to add more States to the Union, which, though not expressly allowed in the Constitution, could be done on the ground of "implied powers."

Washington's whole life, wealth and influence were consecrated to the work of forming the States into a great nation. He believed that the National Government possessed every power not reserved for the States. The right to growth like a tree, to expansion like a merchant, was an inherent right of the Government, as well as the right of self-protection. The great leading principles of Washington's career have been settled forever by the Civil War. Abraham Lincoln said just before his departure: "There will be no future appeal from the ballot to the bullet, but the union of the people of all the States, will rest upon such foundations that no time shall come, in all the future of the nation, for funeral ceremonies at the grave of constitutional and popular liberty."

I sincerely hope raise in price of CHAMPION will not deter a single subscriber, and I hope the enlargement will attract many new friends. The CHAMPION contains articles that are lengthy enough to give a complete discussion of a subject, all the ordinary reader requires for satisfying an earnest inquiring mind.

Surely the CHAMPION will find more friends as the tide turns in favor of Scripture truth and away from some of the fads and isms that have had entirely too much influence. The marked decline of Christian Science signifies something that must impress all who love the truth.—Lawrence Keister, D.D.

The Sanctuary

Repentance

BY AN EVANGELICAL PASTOR*

At the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained: whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. Acts xvii. 30, 31.



N the text we may hear the voice of God addressing every human being, and therefore addressing you and me, commanding a duty which is to be performed at once. Persons: "God"—"all men"; duty: "repent"—"now."

If this duty is to be done "now", then it outranks every other duty. There is no other first duty if we have not done this. So, then, if you and I have not obeyed this command of God, we need not go around inquiring what our duty is, for we know what it is. Before any and everything else, it is our duty to repent, and repent *now*.

And you see there is a wondrous urgency about this.

In the third chapter of Matthew, John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, bursts upon the scene, preaching in the wilderness of Judea; and to the multitude that thronged to hear him his very first word was, "*Repent* ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

In the next chapter Christ begins his ministry, and his first word was, "*Repent*, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." He called unto him twelve disciples and commissioned them to go forth, and we read that "they went out and preached that men should *repent*" (Mk. vi. 12).

Peter, in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, in the very first gospel sermon on record, when by the pungency of his preaching his hearers had been led to cry out, "Men and brethren what shall we do?" responded, "*Repent*, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ."

And Paul, giving to the Ephesian elders at Miletus an account of both his public and private ministry, tells that it consisted in "testifying both to Jews, and also to the Greeks, *repentance* toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

Repent, then, is the gospel's first word addressed to men; and first words are generally key words. Repentance is the first step of the way by which man—a sinner by nature and sinful by practice—comes back to God and adjusts relationships rightly with Him. Well may we, therefore, attend to this first of all duties which God has laid upon the human soul.

I. WHAT IS REPENTANCE?

Much has been written upon this subject, and I have often thought that the multitude of words has darkened counsel. I hope I shall not obscure a matter that ought to be made very plain.

A lady, as a substitute for a much-absent teacher taught a class of boys in our Sunday-School. The golden text for the day was "Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." She asked, "What is repentance?" A bright little fellow answered, "Repentance unto life is a saving grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin, and apprehension of the mercy of God, in

*NOTE:—We are glad to present this sermon as a specimen of pastoral evangelistic preaching, both as to substance and method. While its doctrine is set forth with clearness, what particularly impresses us is the direct, *ad hominem*, thou-art-the-man, personal appeal, a note that is sadly wanting in much, and entirely lacking in not a little present-day pulpit ministrations. If Christ came to seek and to save the lost, why should not all pastors work along this saving line instead of leaving professional evangelists to do it. The author writes: "Please do not use my name, lest it be thought I set myself up as an example to great deal better men and preachers than I am." We are able to state that this pastor year in and year out received members into his church every sacramental season, and on one occasion received over one hundred at one communion. Men don't get what they don't go after.—Editor.

Christ, doth, with grief and hatred of his sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavor after, new obedience." He had studied the Westminster Shorter Catechism, and that is the answer to Q. 87. It is clear, complete, satisfactory; and I wish it were in the memory of every one of us. We would know then what repentance is. But she said, "Now tell me in your own words what repentance is." He said, "It is to be sorry." She appealed to the rest of the class, asking if to be sorry is enough. Another said, "No; you mustn't do it again." And so they were taught that "Repentance is to be sorry for sin and not to do it again." That is good.

A soldier was asked, "What is repentance?" With military promptness he replied, "It is right about face." Edward C. Delevan, of Albany, N. Y., when a young man, used to go to a certain place down street to get his glass of grog. One evening on his way for his accustomed dram, he suddenly bethought himself, "This is ruining me. I must stop it." He instantly turned on his heel and went back to his lodging to be a total abstainer for life.

That was repentance, "right about face," concerning a single sin. But repentance toward God includes all sin and the whole man. The sinner is going away from God, and walking in disobedience. He must "right about face," and go toward God, walking in obedience.

Another has defined repentance to be "sorrow for sin, ending in reformation." A writer of the 17th century has beautifully said that "Repentance is the tear which stands in the eye of faith as it beholds Christ on the cross." Isn't it plain what repentance is?

But I think we would better discriminate a little farther. There are two different Greek words used in the New Testament differing somewhat in signification, and both translated by the one English word "repent." The first is *metanoëo*, to know afterward, or to change one's mind; the second is *metamelomai*, to care afterward or to change one's care. Beza, one of the 16th century reformers, was, I think, the first to call attention to their difference in New Testament signification and use.

The first, as studied, was seen to be an after knowledge; then the change of mind consequent upon this after knowledge; then sorrow for the course pursued preceding the change of mind consequent on this after knowledge; and then, last of all, the change of conduct for the future, springing from all this. This is the word used to denote true repentance, "repentance unto life," as the Scriptures (Acts xi. 18) and the Catechism say.

But there is a false repentance which worketh not life, but death instead, even as St. Paul says in 2 Cor. vii. 10, "For godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death." The second word *metamelomai*, is the word for false repentance. This was used concerning Judas (Matt. xxvii. 3.) where he "repented himself," confessing that he had sinned and betrayed innocent blood; yet, to his enormous crime, he added the awful sin of suicide. Let us be very careful, then, that our repentance be "unto life," and not something short of that.

The true penitent is sorry for his sin; the false penitent is sorry that he is to suffer the penalty of his sin. The one grieves that he has done evil; the other that he must bear the consequences of evil. The one regrets that he deserves punishment; the other that he must undergo punishment. The one laments his crimes; the other that his crimes are brought to light. The one is troubled for his offenses; the other for his losses. The one hates himself because he is a criminal; the other hates the truth that convicts him of criminality. The one approves the law which condemns him; the other condemns the law which disapproves him. To the one, sin is the sum of all that is vile; to the other, it is a comparatively trifling affair. With the one, sorrow for sin is habitual; with the other transient. The one steadfastly turns from sin; the other sins on, and if for a time he seems to reform, he soon returns to his sins as a dog to his vomit. The one obeys because it is right, or because he loves to obey; the other obeys under compulsion, or turns away from the paths of obedience.

In the light of these definitions and discriminations, I think we may see both what repentance is, and also distinguish between true and false repentance. You who think you have repented, test your repentance and see if it be genuine or spurious; and you who have not repented, see what you have to do.

For the sake of emphasis, let us recapitulate. Repentance "is the tear which stands in the eye of faith as it beholds Christ on the cross." Repentance is "sorrow for sin ending in reformation." Repentance is "right about face." Repentance is "to be sorry for sin, and not to do it again." Repentance is "a saving grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin, doth, with grief and hatred of his sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavor after, new obedience."

I think it will be seen from what has been said, that the Christian is the truest and most of a penitent. No one has such sorrow for sin and such turning from it as he.

If I may be pardoned a personal reference, it seems to me there is a constant increase in my conception of the sinfulness of sin, on which sorrow for sin is based. Yet I know perfectly well that it is infinitesimal as compared with what it ought to be. It has been one of the griefs of my Christian experience that my sense of sin has been so weak and small. However, I think I have come to have some apprehension of what the great Jonathan Edwards meant when he said concerning himself:

"My wickedness as I am in myself, has long appeared perfectly ineffable, and swallowing up all thought and imagination. . . . I know not how to express myself better what my sins appear to me to be than by heaping infinite upon infinite. Very often, for these many years, these expressions are in my mind and in my mouth: 'Infinite upon infinite, infinite upon infinite.' . . . And yet it seems to me that my conviction of sin is exceedingly small and faint; it is enough to amaze me, that I have no more sense of sin."

These are not the words of a simpleton, but of one whose mind, with respect to logical keenness and masterly power has seldom been equaled, perhaps never surpassed.

"How often should I repent?" asked one, of the saintly Philip Henry. "How often should you repent? Sir," said he, "I hope to carry repentance to the very gate of heaven." And on another occasion he said: "If I were to die in the pulpit, I would desire to die preaching repentance; or if I die out of the pulpit I would desire to die practicing repentance."

Having seen what repentance is, there comes to us—

II. THE DUTY OF IMMEDIATE REPENTANCE.

God commanded all men—that includes you and me—everywhere to repent. Therefore I call upon each and every person in this audience now to repent.

Before me are two classes: Church members and non-church members. I first call upon the members of the church to repent. Some of you hear this call right gladly, for you are leading lives of daily penitence. You can say with Philip Henry, "I hope to carry repentance to the very gate of heaven." But it is plain that some of you are coming short of that kind of life. The call is then with more emphasis to you,

How about your departures from God, from that fellowship and service you once had? Repent.

Some of you no more "enter the closet and shut to the door": you have abandoned private devotions. Repent.

Some of you have let the fire on the family altar go out. Said little Mary Cameron, over on the Pacific slope, as she anxiously looked with her large, beautiful, sad eyes into her father's face, "Pa, is God dead?" "No, my child. Why do you ask?" "Why, Pa, you never talk to Him now like you used to." I fear there are children here that were it not for what they hear outside of home, would think God is dead. Do you know, parent, that you are exposing your household to the poured-out fury of which Jeremiah speaks, which impends over those families that call not upon God's name? (x. 25). Repent.

Some, without good reason, attend only infrequently upon the sanctuary, if they have not deserted it entirely, disobeying the command to assemble themselves together (Heb. x. 25). Repent.

Some of you are in such complicity with the world, with its pleasures, gaieties, frivolities, that you have lost your testimony for Jesus. You may remember the story of the young woman who had gone all the round of the gaieties of the week, and finally she said on Friday evening that she could not attend a certain place of amusement, and when they put to her the question as to why she must stay away, she said she was a member of the church, and that that was the preparatory service for communion. They looked at her in perfect amazement, and said to her, "What! *You* a member of the church?" How much regard do you think they had for her religion? And there are persons whose names are on *our* church roll who haven't as much respect for Jesus Christ and his church as that miserable young woman had.

Go among publicans and sinners if you will, but go *as* Christ went, to win them to himself. He did win them, and they were the first to go into the kingdom of God. Do not go among them to be with and of them, finding there your companionship and satisfaction. If that is the kind of Christian you are, you had better understand that the world is laughing at you, and despises you too, as it ought to. Repent: "come ye out from among them, and be ye separate."

Some of you are in such relations with others that you are exemplifying anything but the spirit of the gospel. You are at variance with your neighbor, apparently not even trying to heed Jesus' command to "love your neighbor as yourself." Repent.

And I have heard, though I have no personal knowledge of the alleged fact, that there are members of this church who will not even speak to each other. Is it possible that this is so?

I know the name, which I do not give, of an employee on the Boston and Albany railroad, who was killed by the cars. There were in the family the father, the mother, this son and a daughter. The father and mother had a difficulty and separated; the mother taking the son who became her support, the father the daughter. At the funeral in Albany, when the coffin lid was removed to enable a last look at the face of the deceased, the father and mother stood on opposite sides of the coffin. They had not spoken for years; but as they raised their eyes from their last look at their dead boy's features, each met the other's gaze. They impulsively embraced each other, and there, their dead child lying between, a reconciliation took place, each agreeing to forgive the past.

Is it so that some of you meet here at the communion table spread with the memorials of the dead body of the precious Saviour, these bruised and broken emblems passing between you, and you go away with no sign of brotherly recognition and reconciliation, the old hatred in your hearts? Isn't this awful? The evidence that we have passed from death unto life, St. John tells us (1 Jno. iii. 14) is that "we love the brethren"; and the next verse gives God testimony in these words "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer; and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." Repent, repent of this your great wickedness.

Let me advise you not to permit this day's sun to go down on your hatred, but the first thing you do, effect reconciliation, even though it be to your utter humiliation. If you are the one in the wrong, you certainly ought to; and if you are not in the wrong, then surely you are in the best possible position to do it, for you have nothing in your way to keep you back.

Another matter. For weeks, yes for months, there have been those here who have been praying for the outpouring of God's Spirit upon us. Special prayer and supplication have been made. But not a few members of this church seem indifferent to the whole thing. There are parents who have children, some of them already young men and women, on the downward road to death, and who have not had care enough for their salvation to request prayer for them when requesting has been invited. Some of you have not had interest enough even to put in an appearance at the place where prayer is made. What do you suppose they think of you? Hadn't you better get up and get out of the way, lest your children and your neighbors stumble over you into hell? You need not wonder if they say: "Well, if professed Christians do not care more than they seem to, I guess I need not be concerned."

A father in the stock regions of the West had amassed great wealth, and was intent on adding riches to riches, all for a son whom he almost idolized. The young man, as I remember the incident, was injured in a "round-up" by being thrown from his horse. He was brought home, and the doctor said he could live but a few hours at longest. The boy turned, appealing piteously to his fond father, saying: "*Have I got to die? Oh, why didn't you prepare me for this? Father, father, I can't die so!*" Gladly would the father have given every cent he possessed if he could have bribed death to stay away. But he could not. Those dying reproaches left wounds in that unfaithful parent's mind that will never be healed so long as memory holds sway.

I have heard told an incident of a New York home. As a father came home from some business that he must attend to, the mother met him at the door, sorrow, but a sorrow irradiated with submissive content, speaking forth from her eyes and face, and she said, "The doctor says James probably cannot live longer than until night. I cannot tell him; you go." The father went into the sick room. The lad stretched out his hands with welcome, and he smiled as he said, "Father, I think I cannot live long. Maybe by night I shall be with Jesus. Won't you be glad for me? How good you and mother were to teach me to love my Saviour and try to live for Him. But He does not want me to live *for* Him here; so He is going to take me to live *with* Him in heaven. You won't feel bad, will you, when I am gone? It won't be long before you and mother will come too, and how happy we will be there, all together with Jesus."

Parents, what memories would you have if your children should find this day to be their last? Oh, ye indifferent, ye unfaithful ones, repent, repent of your indifference and unfaithfulness. If your life before your household has been such as to seal your lips heretofore, let me counsel you to call your family together and just frankly confess your sins to them, right your wrongs, and then take them by the hand and lead them in the heavenward way lest you and they, alike impenitent and indifferent to the claims of God, go to the perdition of ungodly men together.

There may be other phases of delinquencies that deserve special mention, but I must turn to another class of hearers. Yet let me say this: you who are conscious of *any* unsorrored, or rather unforsaken sin, repent.

It may be that unconverted ones here today—not always so charitably disposed as they might be—have in a measure enjoyed some of the severe things said to church members. I assure you it gives me more pain to say severe things than it does those to hear them to whom they are adapted. But, do you know, there is not an obligation resting upon a Christian respecting God and His cause that does not rest on *you* likewise! Take no consolation to yourself from these things, for, as you may read in 1 Peter iv. 17, "If judgment begin at the house of God, what shall be the end of those who obey not the gospel of God?"; and in the next verse, "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"

The call, therefore, to you is to repent, and repent now. I will give you reasons why you should do this.

1. The first reason is *because God commands it*. Isn't that reason enough? *God commands it*. It is therefore right for you to repent, and wrong for you not to. If you fairly and squarely refuse to do what you know to be right, and fairly and squarely continue to do what you know to be wrong, what can you say for yourself? What answer will you make to God, or at the bar of your own self respect? God's commands are always right. Repent, therefore, *because God commands it*.

2. A second reason is *because you are sinning against the best and kindest being in the universe*, and it is high time you ceased to abuse such goodness.

I have read of a boy, a young man, who turned his back on his loving father and pleasant home, and wandered off, a prodigal. The father heard of him on the Pacific coast, going on from bad to worse. He said to a friend going to California, "If you find my boy I wish you would tell him I love him as much as ever I did, and that if he will come home he shan't have a word, but

shall receive a warm welcome instead." The man found the boy past midnight in a San Francisco gambling den. He put his hand kindly on his shoulder, took him to one side and told him his father's message. The young man began to tremble. "What! does my father love me as well as he ever did?" he asked. "Yes," was the reply, "and he wants you to come home." The message just broke the poor prodigal's heart.

Friend, that is the message to you to-day of your kind heavenly Father, whose goodness and mercy have followed you all the days of your life. He loves you notwithstanding you have so sinfully turned your back on Him, and He wants you to come home. Right about face to-day, now.

3. * Another reason is *because the longer you put it off the less likely will you be to repent.*

A minister had been preaching to the young of his charge to remember their Creator in the days of their youth, and urging this reason which I am now giving. As he came down from the pulpit he was met by an aged man who said with deep emotion, "Sir, what you have just spoken is undeniably true. I know it from my own experience. When I was young I said to myself, I cannot give up the world now, but I will by and by. When I have passed the meridian of life and begin to sink in the vale of the years, then I will become a Christian; then I shall be ready to attend to the concerns of my soul. But here I am, an old man, and I am not a Christian. I feel no disposition to enter upon the work of my salvation. In looking back, I often feel that I would give worlds if I could be placed where I was in my youth."

On another occasion this same aged man took a grandchild on his knee, and urged him to seek God now—to pray to Him and love Him. The child looking up, asked, "But, grandpa, why do not *you* seek Him?" Deeply moved by the question, he answered, "I would, my child, but *my heart is hard, my heart is hard.*"

My hearer, is not your heart harder than it was? And I warn you that it will be harder still after listening to this sermon to-day, unless you yield to its persuasions. If you will not repent now, think you you will repent when your heart becomes still harder? Therefore repent now.

And I want to warn you against death bed or sick bed repentances, so called. Attend to this matter while you are in health and your head is clear, so you will know what you are about. These so-called death bed repentances make me think of the medical professor's reply to the student who asked him how to tell the difference between a mushroom and a toadstool. Said the professor, "Eat it, and if it kills you it is toadstool; if you live, it's mushroom." So, these so-called death bed repentances: if the person dies we charitably hope and say the repentance was genuine; if he gets well, most likely it will prove spurious; for, an American physician has reported over 100 cases of persons hopefully converted in prospect of death, but on recovery not more than three devoted themselves to the service of Christ. And an English physician says that out of 300 such cases that he knew, only ten, so far as he saw, gave any evidence of being really regenerated.

Do you not think there is something insufferably mean in draining the cup of life to its last dregs, and then offering that miserable remnant to God as a satisfaction for its wasted contents? I can see how a man can go to hell and preserve his self respect, but I do not see how he can preserve his self respect and at the last moment if that *be* possible, crawl into heaven like a sneak. The best of life, and the whole of life, are none too good or too much to give to God. Therefore repent now.

4. Another reason is *because to-morrow may be too late.*

You have no promise of to-morrow. Do you remember the loss of the vessel called the "Central America?" She sprang a leak and hoisted a signal of distress. A ship came close to her, the captain of which asked through his trumpet, "What is amiss?" "We are in bad repair, and are going down; lie by for us till morning," was the reply. "Let me take your passengers on board now," was sounded over the waters. "No; lie by till morning," was

the response. About an hour and a half later the lights were missing. Not a sound was heard, and the cruel, treacherous sea swept its billows unconcernedly on, telling no tale that that ship and all on board had gone down into the fathomless abyss.

My unconverted hearer, do not say "Lie by till morning," and that "to-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant." You have no promise of to-morrow. Therefore repent now.

5. Another reason is *because of the utter hopelessness of your position under the law.*

You, impenitent sinner, are not under the gospel as yet, but are under the law. Do you know your position there? Some one said of the rebellious Mormons in Utah, that the only rights they had were the political right to be hanged and the divine right to be damned. Do you know that under God's law the only right you have is the divine right to be damned?

Turn to the third chapter of John's gospel, and at verse 36 you may read: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth"—the revision says obeyeth—"not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." And again: "He that believeth on Him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already" (vs. 18). Is it not therefore perfectly plain that every person who goes from this house to-day impenitent, goes under a sentence of condemnation—"condemned already?"

But God is mercifully staying the execution of the law, and giving you opportunity by repentance to escape. The law, however, knows nothing of repentance. What sort of a statute against highway robbery would that be which would have with it a promise of pardon if the robber would repent! Repentance is not a provision of law, but of Gospel grace, and as such is possible only on the ground of the satisfaction which Christ has rendered to the law. Heed, then, the Gospel call to repent, and escape from under the law where is the certainty of perdition, and come under the Gospel where you have the right to and the possession of salvation. You see the utter hopelessness of your position under the law. Therefore repent.

6. Another reason is *that you may have a roomy coffin.* You will see, directly, what I mean.

I knew a minister in St. Louis who tells of a man hanged there for murder. The night before his execution he had a troubled dreamy sleep. Said he: "I thought I was led forth to the scaffold, my arms were pinioned, the rope adjusted around my neck with its knot under my left ear, the cap drawn over my face, and just as I felt the trap give way under my feet, the man I had murdered appeared, and clutching me by the legs as I fell, jerked me down with fiendish delight. Then my body was placed in a coffin and borne to the grave, but the murdered man followed with a cold, stony gaze fixed upon me. Finally they lowered me into the grave, and then down he came, with the blood oozing from the wound I had made in his breast, crowding right into the coffin. I begged him to leave me, but he hissed, 'You are going straight to hell, and I am going with you to torment your soul forever.'"

You think this is horrible. Well, it is horrible. But let us face facts. Can you give any reason why murder, a sin against the Sixth Commandment, should cling to a man and torment him worse than a sin against any other of the Commandments? I tell you, friends, you who are going on in rejection of the Lord Jesus Christ, doing despite to the spirit of grace, trampling under your feet the blood of the Son of God, piling up sins against your Maker, you will be crowded hard if you don't repent and get rid of your sins.

There may be no murdered body, dripping its slimy, bloody ooze upon you, but there will be the follies of your youth, the sins of your middle life, the iniquities of your later years; there will come your disobediences, your dishonesties, your profanities, your drunkennesses, your lecheries; there will come God's mercies despised, the claims of a crucified Saviour disregarded, opportunities wasted, the early impressions (made by father or mother, or by your religious teachers) crushed, convictions stifled, the offers of a free pardon

refused;—these will be some of the companions that will be found crowding into the coffin, to attend the unrepentant, guilty soul to its everlasting destiny. Therefore repent.

7. A final reason I name is *the one explicitly stated in the text*: "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which He will judge the world in righteousness, by that Man whom He hath ordained."

Hear these divine testimonies: Heb. ix. 27, "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." Eccl. xii. 14, "For God shall bring every work into judgment." Rev. xx. 21, "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books." Matt. xxv., "Before Him shall be gathered all nations; and He shall separate them, one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats. And He shall set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall He say unto them on His right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . . Then shall He say unto them on His left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

I doubt not when Peter preached the first recorded gospel sermon, so fraught with law, judgment and condemnation, there were those who said, "Harsh man! austere preacher!" as perhaps some of you are saying now. Oh, if you knew the tenderness that is in my heart for you, you would not say that. But when they were brought to the state of mind to ask, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" after telling them what to do, he breathed upon them the very benediction of God, saying, "The promise"—just think of it, *promise!*—"the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are far off, even as many as the Lord shall call."

Sinners, all, whether in the church or out of the church, how far so ever you have wandered, how low so ever you have fallen, even the chiefest of sinners, I breathe upon you this benediction of God: Proverbs xxviii. 13, "whoso confesseth his sins and forsaketh them, shall have mercy."

Repent, therefore, and receive the mercy of God, even life and salvation through Jesus Christ. Will you?

* * *

On a monument erected in one of the highest passes of the Andes to commemorate a peaceful settlement of a threatened war between Chili and Argentine, are carved the words:

"Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust
than Chili and Argentine break the peace which
at the feet of Christ the Redeemer they
have sworn to maintain."

Until America in the spite of that pledge puts aside all self-righteousness, sees its own shortcomings as Almighty God sees them, and humbly seeks divine forgiveness and divine wisdom, it cannot become a real spiritual leader of the world, for it cannot hold aloft the uplifted Christ as the only salvation of the world from sin and wars. The welfare of business, the safety of our country and of the world from wars and endless crimes, are staked on this, and woe betide our future if we fail to read the signs of the times and call the nation to a revival of religion, pure and undefiled. In vain will we talk disarmament, in vain will we decry war and expect peace while the world is ruled by sin and while America fails to fit itself to become a moral and spiritual leader of mankind.

—Richard H. Edmonds in *Manufacturer's Record*.

The January number of the CHAMPION was a "hummer." I sat up way beyond my usual time to retire to read it. Welcome the enlarged CHAMPION, so long as the standard is maintained. My best wishes to entire staff of editors and the publisher for the New Year.—Rev. Jno. A. Grose.

Sidelights

ALWAYS A BRIGHT AND STEADY LIGHT

Every Christian is meant to be a bright and steady witness to the truth of the religion he professes. If this be so, no faculty or talent should be neglected that, if polished up and displayed, may serve to light men on the way to God. "Keep your lantern by you!" was the peremptory order given by a railway conductor to a raw trainman. "You never know when it will be needed! You must not be at one end of the car, when anything happens, and your lantern at the other!" This is good advice for every church member, who ought never to suffer himself to become separated, so to speak, from the utilities or instruments which may assist his clear and unmistakable witness for Christ. The influence of the world constantly tends to put out or to dim one's religious light. Remember that we are to be beacons, and the darker the historic night, or the wilder the social storms, the more is the need that when human mariners look toward the place where we ought to be they may glimpse the gladdening, directing ray of our Christian light and gleam.—*Zion's Herald*.

GOD'S FINGERS

During a revival service a man prayed for the conversion of a neighbor and said: "O Lord, touch my neighbor with thy finger, with thy finger, O Lord." Just then an inner voice said: "You are God's finger. Did you ever speak to your neighbor concerning his soul's salvation? You go and touch the man and your prayer shall be heard!" The man arose. His conscience was awakened and accused him. Almost a lifetime had he lived near his neighbor, and not once had he spoken to him about the need of regeneration. Hundreds of opportunities came and went, but the conversation at such times was not about the one thing needful, but about the weather, politics, crops, business, etc. The first duty of a Christian, to witness for Christ, was left unfulfilled. How is it with us?—*The Christian Conservator*.

THE FAILURE OF ENVIRONMENT

Perfect surroundings will never make men perfect. A preacher, describing different types of men and women who come to Christ and are disappointed in what they find, has said: "Then came the social reformer, bent on open spaces and wholesome drains and decent dwellings and living wages. But Christ said, 'My kingdom is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy.'" Improved social conditions are results of salvation, never the cause of it. We may properly make them introductions to the Gospel; unless we do this, they will fail to lift human nature by an inch. God's own description of the Millennium, earth's Golden Age, when the social conditions will utterly eclipse the best that any modern social reformer hopes for, is the most overwhelming proof of the failure of mere social service. For after a thousand years of an ideal earth and ideal society, the number of men who follow Satan in open revolt against God is "as the sand of the sea" (Rev. 20:8); and human nature goes down in black catastrophe, under the deserved judgment of God, in the midst of perfect social conditions. God's plan is the only one that works: "Seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."—*S. S. Times*.

TAKE TIME TO SET THE SOUL RIGHT

Every day, from the city observatory at Madras, India, the timepieces of over nine thousand telegraph offices in the Empire are set right, and the operation takes two minutes. It is worth while, so the Government thinks, to stop traffic on over 72,000 miles of telegraph lines, and over 287,000 miles of telegraphic wire, at least once every twenty-four hours, to correct wayward clocks and set them to the sun. If taking time to set clocks right is of such importance in an empire, which will one day crumble into dust, how much more important it is to take time to set the soul right, which is to live throughout the eternal ages.—*Ida Q. Moulton*.

Prayer Meeting Service

BY A. WILLIAM LEWIS, B.A., B.D., INDIANOLA, NEBRASKA.

The word February is from a Sabine word for means of purification. . . . This is suggestive. We should purify our body, mind, heart and soul. The purpose of this is not merely selfish but altruistic. Water is purified by activity; and so the life is purified by activity for the good of others. "Jesus went about doing good."

"God Has Spoken"

Hebrews 1:1-14.



OD has spoken to man in every age. He has not left Himself without a witness. Acts 14:17. How has He spoken to YOU?

Some demand signs and wonders, an audible voice. Elijah in the cave appreciated "the still, small voice," inaudible. I Kings 19:12. God spoke to Moses in the Burning Bush; and the Father spoke to Jesus at His baptism, and on other occasions. Jesus glorified spoke with Saul. God has always spoken to man through Nature and Providence. Scientists have wondered and adored Him. Lord Kelvin said that his greatest discovery was when he found Jesus Christ as his personal Saviour. Evolution has increased the glory of the universe. The eye, the knee joint, almost any part of man's marvelous body bears witness to God.

"Of old time . . . in the prophets." Cyrus of Persia heard His Word. (Ezra 1.) Buddha of India gave the world a wonderful Gospel; and he said: "Five hundred years after me there shall be another and greater Buddha." Then it was that Jesus came, the clearest revelation of God. As Jesus prophesied, the Holy Spirit was given; and He through our conscience speaks to us, as He speaks to animals by their instinct. This is above and beyond reason; and our own consciousness is the final appeal for each of us individually. It is the will of God as we can understand it.

Paul was a sample of the millions, who have not been disobedient to the heavenly vision. Lew Wallace studied the Bible that he might refute it; but he became convinced of its truth, and he wrote Ben Hur. Giovanni Papini of Italy was one of the most violent radicals, and for twenty years criticised destructively

everything good. During the war in distraction he fled to the peasants among the hills; and he found there peace in Jesus Christ. He has written a wonderful and virile life of Jesus, "*Storia di Christo*." Such was Leo Tolstoi.

God speaks today through lives devoted to Him. A ruffian spoke to Captain Bickel in Japan of another, "He is not ready yet for that Bible. YOU ARE HIS BIBLE AND MINE. If you fail, Christ fails." When Mary Morrill was martyred in Peking by the Boxers, a young soldier saw her bravery with wonder. He studied the motive of the Christians, and became one. He rose until he has become the "Christian General" of China, and a Governor. God spoke through Mary Morrill to Feng Yu Sien. And now nearly all the army of 21,000 are Christians, and all the officers.

*

"Over Against the Treasury"

Mark 12:41-44.

Jesus was practical. He saw beneath the surface. He knew how money was a guage of manhood, but not as men see it. Giving can be understood only when we know the ability. Copper may out-rank gold.

It is a mockery for people with money to say, "I will give the widow's mite." It is not the widow's mite, unless it is all that you have. Paul wrote, "Alexander the coppersmith has done me much harm." The coppers seen in Church collection plates are generally a verdict of guilt. If children spend money on candy and gum, they should never put a copper in the contribution box. Jesus did not condemn the rich for giving gold; but He commended the widow for giving what meant far more to her. So today God knows that the wealthy often give far less than the poor, when we consider their ability. The gold of the rich will do far more good to others, but the giving of it will not do themselves so much good as the giving of a smaller sum by

the poor will do to the poor. We must distinguish between the value of the gift to the need of the world, and the credit it brings upon the giver.

This truth should stir the wealthy to give until they feel it. It is unbecoming a Christian to die rich. Having made sufficient provision for their family, they ought to give all their living, if they wish to emulate the poor widow. Again, if we are poor, we should not grieve overmuch that we cannot give like the millionaires. God will be satisfied if we give like the poor widow, "all her living." A negro sexton of a Church asked a stranger, "Are you of the artificial members of this Church?" He meant, official members; but he unwittingly described many members of the Churches. Too many are artificial, nominal, without growth in this grace.

The fact is that the larger part of the Church's revenue is from the poorer classes, rather than from the rich; and if the smaller gifts were doubled or trebled, as they might easily be, the Church's work might be fittingly enlarged.

*

"The Brook Cherith"

I Kings 17:1-16.

We are told that there are two perennial brooks in Palestine,—Kidron flowing from Jerusalem, and Cherith on the east of the Jordan. What did Elijah think when Cherith was drying up? Had not God sent him there? In good time the word of the Lord came to him to move to Zarephath, near Sidon, on the Mediterranean Sea. This he found to be a big step in advance. He was starved out of Cherith that he might live better and do better service. And God is doing that very thing today in millions of cases. He dries up our springs of comfort and of living that we may set out for new fields of greater service and nobler satisfaction. This is especially true of teachers and preachers, and some other people.

It is true nationally. When Germany saw her hopes of militarism failing, it was then that her people turned to the only hope of abiding greatness, a Democracy of industry and government. The Boers of South Africa saw their Cherith going dry; but they were forced into a higher state of civilization under British oversight. Ian Smuts, the Boer General,

is a most loyal Britisher. He has said, "We fought for liberty; and when the British conquered us, they gave us our liberty." He has become the successor of Botha, the premier of United South Africa. The Confederates of the South saw their Cherith dry; but they found a higher destiny, as was soon frankly acknowledged by Gen. Robert E. Lee, one of America's noblest. The Puritans were driven out of England by their thirst for religious liberty; and they came into a grander national life in America.

The biographies of many great lives show us that the drying up of their Cherith was the beginning of their grander achievements. Cecil Rhodes was tubercular in England, but found health and fortune and eternal fame in South Africa. Dr. Wilfred Grenfell was disappointed in the North Sea, and the lure of the Labrador led him on to national fame for unique service to humanity. Rev. R. J. Campbell of City Temple, London, found his philosophy unsatisfying; and he turned to the abounding satisfaction of orthodox belief in the Bible and in Christ. The springs of youth are always drying up, but deeper springs are found. With a "high heart when it is hard" let us follow the guidance of the Heavenly Father.

*

"The Wells of Salvation"

Isaiah 12.

Vice-President Coolidge spoke at the Amherst Centennial; and the burden of the whole address was this vital truth, that the world's only hope is to get back to the great spiritual values.

God has surrounded man with sources of eternal life; and we must find them and drink of these wells of salvage. The mother's part is to start us right. Hagar found the well for Ishmael. Afterwards he found his life elsewhere. We live according to our correspondences.

The highest values are spiritual. If the wells are impure, it is not enough to paint the pump. Clean out the well and fix the valves. There will be less noise and more water. The Bible is a valley of ten thousand wells, better than the "Valley of Ten Thousand Smokes" in Alaska. The American Bible Society is deserving of much help in the cause of humanity and of Americanism. If the Church is dry, it is somebody's fault.

It is a well divine. Social Service gives great satisfaction. Prayer is a deep, pure well; and if it is not a joy, no one can be blamed but oneself. The cisterns of the world are bound to leak sooner or

later; but the wells of God never go dry.

"Open Thou his eyes that he may see
The strength eternal; tho' he stands alone,
Yet his is wedded with Infinity."

Library Table

Studies in Christianity

BY HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D., BRIDGETON, NEW JERSEY



THE attitude of mind that we insist upon for ourselves in all this theological discussion, and that we are anxious to give expression too early in this series of critical reviews, is that of Christian charity. For this reason we are placing the review of Professor Bowne's book among the first, since our personal affection for him as a philosophical thinker, and our belief in him as a Christian heart will make it both fitting and necessary that we should distinguish Bowne's Christian personality from his defective book, and his strength as a philosopher from his weakness as a theologian.

Here are three propositions that careful thought will show to be true. We will not seek to prove them, but will simply set them down. First, a man may hold right heart attitudes on the basis of defective opinions. The opposite is also possible. Nevertheless, right opinions are a great aid to right heart attitudes. Indeed, for the social body as a whole, and in the long run, opinions will determine heart attitudes; it is the individual alone who finds some large measure of separation between these two. It is on the basis of these facts that we would give the judgment that the Church can afford to be very tolerant of defective opinions in private life, but must insist upon its established standards in every teaching office.

Second, the Christian theologian must have one qualification in addition to those which are required for the philosopher. He must have a robust faith in the Christian Bible: it must stand to him as the sufficient rule both of faith and practise. The Christian theologian has thus a considerable body of truth in addition to those intuitions of the mind which he shares with the philosopher. And this larger body of truth of the theologian is not verifiable in the intuitions of the mind. The heart and conscience give it some confirmation, certainly, but the heart and conscience are both abnormal through sin, so that their reaction is of questionable authority. We would put it this way: The heart and conscience, as energised and elevated by some deep experience, will confirm the Biblical revelation. And this judgment of the elevated and ennobled conscience, when regarded broadly through the years, adequately establish the authority of the Christian's Bible. We would pause here long enough to point out that faith has here an objective authority that it can unhesitatingly pass on from generation to generation as the standard of truth and duty. And that while this standard is not subject to the vagaries of individual subjectivities, it is, nevertheless, being ever anew confirmed by the elevated consciousness of the Christian community.

And, third, if a philosopher, whose opinion was halting at the point of the Christian's Bible, should undertake to write theology, we would expect to find him cutting off the highest peaks of Christian truth, and settling back toward the ethical monotheism of Israel.

These three propositions, which we offer without discussion are the basis for our own understanding of the problem of Professor Bowne's Christian heart, magnificent intellect, and divergent opinions. Bowne has a halting attitude toward the Bible, and consequently his thinking is defective from the

Christian point of view by the loss of the biblical contribution. He keeps the essential deity of Christ because his own heart is so entwined here that he will not let his intellectualism sacrifice it. But he constructs a system of belief in which this unique and sublime figure has no place. He reduces Christianity to a body of theistic ethics in which Christ stands simply as the supreme teacher and example. He has no stupendous atoning sacrifice, no all-sufficient redemption; he has nothing beyond Judaism except the Sermon on the Mount and the example of Jesus.

Doubtless the question will be in some one's mind, how then does it happen that Professor Bowne was acquitted of heresy charges before the New York East Conference? We make this answer: It is one thing to say that a teacher is heretical, and another to say that a certain book from his pen comes decidedly short of being in harmony with Methodist standards. It was Bowne, not his book that was on trial then, and if Bowne, as it is reported that he did, professed belief in our established standards this profession was his sufficient defense. But not to spend any more time with these secondary matters, let us turn to the book itself.

First, with respect to the Bible. Bowne writes on pages 24-25, "The great significance of the Christian revelation, then, does not lie in its contribution to ethics or to speculative theology, though it has done something in both these realms; but rather in this, that back of the mystery and uncertainty of our lives, . . . it reveals God, the almighty friend and lover of men." The meaning of this passage, as any reader familiar with the whole current of Bowne's thinking will see, is that the Bible is a divine revelation only in its great main movement rather than in all its ethical and doctrinal details. He says exactly this on page 40 where, after repudiating the idea that the Bible is infallible in detail, or even in every detail of its conception of God, he goes on and affirms that the biblical

"Revelation consists in what we have learned concerning God, his character, and his purposes: and the revelation is mainly made by a great historical movement. Of this movement the Bible is at once the product and the historical and literary record. The truth of the revelation depends on the general truth of the history, and not at all on the infallibility of the record."

And similarly again on page 44: "Christianity does not affirm an infallible Bible, but a self-revealing God. It holds that God was in the historical movement out of which the Bible came, and in it in such a way, that out of it we have won a supremely valuable knowledge of God. Whatever else was or was not there, God was there guiding the movement for his own self-revelation. This is the true and the only Christian faith in this matter."

The Bible, then, for Bowne, is scarcely, if anything, more than a comparatively accurate record of the divine providences that have over-ruled in the world's history. And these providences are brought about not by extraordinary divine revelations through common men, so much as by ordinary revelations through men of genius. On page 83 Bowne speaks of the liberal opinion which says the

"Bible is no revelation by God to man but a revelation by man to man," and criticises it in this way: "God is no longer so easily ruled out by a verbal antithesis. . . . In the human world God is less a with-worker than a through-worker, but he works nevertheless to will and to work of his own good pleasure."

This opinion would seem to reduce revelation about to the work of human genius in interpreting God. We say, about, for Bowne does not say that God never is a with-worker, but that he is less a with- than a through-worker; and on page 81 he does speak of the Holy Spirit as working on the minds and hearts of holy men. But on page 80 he definitely rejects "the old view of the Bible," as an opinion discarded and disproved; nor can one without assuming a colossal ignorance on Bowne's part apply this remark to the verbal inspiration theory exclusively. Verbal inspiration is one out of several theories that the Church has offered to explain its doctrine that the Bible is the only and sufficient rule both of faith and practise. The view that the Bible is the absolute standard of moral and religious truth is the view that Bowne, if he was intelligent, was referring to.

But finally, at this point, we would call attention to the fact that on page 81 Bowne tells us that the men through whom the divine revelation came did not understand it. We quote his words:

"We see that it was conditioned by the imperfections of the men to whom it came. They did not understand it. They had no such conception of the divine meaning as we possess. God is the great exigete, and he makes clear now what he meant then, but the men in the midst of the process had no clear vision."

Now, had the author been an exponent of any form of a fully supernatural divine revelation, this passage would not have been significant. But we protest, that when men speak only by natural power, when they speak only that which they understand of God that in so far as they did not understand Him, they misrepresented Him. If a prophet was the mouthpiece for the divine intelligence, then he might be said to understand only partly, or even not at all, and yet his message have remained truth; but when men of natural insight speak what they do not understand about God and his purposes they speak what is not so. The author's theory of the Bible reduces it to a patchwork of truth and error, that must set up the individual soul to separate for itself the one from the other.

The errancy, which Bowne thus gets into his Bible, he uses constantly in his other chapters, for he rejects the biblical conception of sin, of Atonement in the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, of justification by faith, and other great Christian truths. Indeed Bowne is, as Professor Faulkner points out in his book, "*Modernism and the Christian Faith*," a strong "liberal."

With respect to sin the author is an evolutionist. Man sins, because the animal in him is as yet not outgrown. And God's attitude is not one of burning condemnation that can only forgive through a tremendous act of self-propitiation, but is rather one of complacent tolerance. He knows that man must pass through these mistakes in coming up to higher and nobler spiritual levels. The biblical idea that sin is not only an act of the will, but a deep nature, a universal depravity, he rejects as a fiction. His own words will make his positions fully clear.

His evolutionary position comes out on page 145.

"Our development," he says, "began on a submoral plane. That was not first which was spiritual, but that which was animal. . . . Whatever may have been true of the first man, this word of Paul's is true of his descendants; and the reported performances of even the first man would not seem to set him very high in the scale of development. By consequence, sin itself, in many of its aspects, is a relic of the animal not yet outgrown, a result of the mechanism of appetite and impulse and reflex action for which the proper inhibitions are not yet developed and only slowly does it grow into a consciousness of itself as evil."

Our great Professor, and we use the description sincerely, had evidently thought little about sin, and had studied but superficially the profound biblical teaching concerning it. Even the Genesis account, which Bowne thinks is rather primitive, is profound compared with his thinking here. In Genesis it is clear that the genius of the first temptation was not physical, but spiritual. It was chiefly because the fruit of the tree was desirable to make wise, because it would make man self-sufficient in wisdom, because it would gratify his desire for self-exaltation even to equality with God, that he chose it. The problem of sin is scarcely animal at all. It is largely spiritual. The real motive of sin is utterly beyond the beast. It is man's sense of self, his towering consciousness of self blinding him to all beside that is the spring of his sin. That he expresses this spirit of self-intoxication in physical excess is but incidental; it is the unbalanced sense of self that is the power of evil in him.

On page 220-221 Bowne expresses his view of God's easy tolerance of sin, thus:

"They are (that is, men are) to pass from the unconsciousness of nature and the ignorance of childhood to the conscious recognition and acceptance of the divine will; and then they are to go on with God in deepening sympathy and growing fellowship forever. This is God's eternal thought for men, and it is not modified in any way in its essential nature by the fact of sin. Of course much of what we call sin is error and mistake, arising from the ignorance of men who have to feel their way. And sin itself, as we find it among men, is largely the wilfulness of freedom which has not learned self-control, rather than any deliberate choice of evil.

Ignorance and untrained wilfulness abound, and both alike must be removed, or they will increase, and lead to disaster. . . . But during the process we must not indulge in extravagant condemnation by bringing in the categories of abstract theological ethics."

One is moved to compare this with Paul's conception, in Romans, of God giving man up to the reprobate mind, and of His forgiving sin, either before or since Christ, only with a view to that supreme atoning work; or with the Savior's own burning denunciation of sin, and His conception that His death was a ransom for many. But, doubtless, Bowne would regard these ideas as a part of the dross of human mistake, with which the pure gold of God's fatherly love was mixed in the revelational process. The familiar way of getting rid of these ideas is to make them corruptions, either by Jewish or Roman conceptions, of the sublime truth of God's perfect fatherly love which not even the apostles had yet seen, and which, if Jesus taught it, they afterward corrupted with these additions. But we move on from the author's conception of sin, and set forth his view of salvation.

Bowne has no smallest appreciation of the Christian truth that Christ died to make atonement for man's sin. To him this view is utterly artificial. Now any one who has done any deep thinking at this point can easily understand Bowne. He came up against the surface difficulties of the Christian view, and did not have a sufficiently robust faith in the Bible to hold him steady until he worked deeper. It sounds very reasonable to say that the Father's love needed no atonement, and that God forgives as a human father would, and that God needed not to be reconciled to sinners, never having felt estrangement. But these statements are all on the surface, and they do not touch the deeper realities of moral order in which the Bible moves. But from the beginning, this doctrine of propitiation and atonement has been preached as the very central doctrine of Christianity. Every great epoch in the Church's life has seen this truth supremely emphasized. The Reformation and the Wesleyan revival both alike put supreme stress here. Is it likely that the centuries, as well as the Bible, are mistaken? Is it not wonderful that this so called error has been supremely fruitful in Christian history? But this is exactly the position we are forced into by Bowne and the other liberals.

There is a sentence on page 160 that makes his position indubitably clear. He says:

"How then are the sins of the world to be taken away? This question in a forensic sense we dismiss altogether as being fictitious."

Similarly on page 162 he says the same: "The Redeemer's work . . . was not a fictitious haggling with abstract and fictitious justice. It was Infinite Love going forth to seek and to save the lost. It was the father of the prodigal going in search of his boy. It was the Good Shepherd giving his life for the sheep; not, of course, at the demand of justice, but at the instance of divine love. This is the true vicariousness of love, of sympathy, of the living moral reason, not an abstract and fictitious vicariousness which no one can understand or find any place for in an unsophisticated conscience."

Of course the author uses offensive language to discredit the view he is rejecting. But such ugly words as "haggling," and "fictitious justice" cannot blind the careful thinker to the fact that Bowne is throwing away the biblical truth that Christ made Atonement, Satisfaction, Propitiation, Expiation, for the guilt of our sin, and we would point out that these are New Testament words.

But the author interprets still further the work of Christ as God's sympathetic suffering with man. But notice that the suffering is always something that is incidental to His effort to win men from sin. It is not a moral end divinely purposed and borne on our behalf. "There is no provision made . . . for letting sinners off," says Bowne. Later he asks, "And is this all there is in the Atonement?" And answers: "In reply, we say we no longer care to use the word atonement, as it has become misleading or uncertain through long association with doubtful theological theories."

One further reference at this point of redemption. He says on page 228:

"Conversion, then, is a turning from the wrong road into the right one. It is not to be understood, in . . . a theological sense, as implying some difficult forensic adjustment in the courts of heaven whereby the antithesis of justice and mercy is happily mediated."

In the light of these passages it is useless to deny that Bowne was utterly out of sympathy with the Christian doctrine of propitiation in the cross of Jesus, and its complementary truth, justification by faith. Indeed his constant caricaturing of them would seem to suggest that he had never given to them any deep and thoughtful attention.

But no matter, in spite of our Professor and his real great learning these truths stand and will stand. The second of the Methodist Articles of Religion defines Christ's work as that of reconciling His Father to us, and the twentieth defines His cross as a redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all sin, both original and actual; and every other branch of the Christian Church has its similar formulations.

But once again to the author: his view of the new birth is about as halting as those we have examined. Here are a few passages: On page 231, he says:

"The importance of conversion in the Christian sense of the term cannot be overestimated. But the popular thought is not Christian. For it the test of conversion is about this: Have they had some rhapsodic experience or some great emotional rapture? Have strange and extraordinary psychological events taken place in their consciousness? If not, then they may be 'moral,' but they are not converted. Probably even yet many churches could be found where the serious purpose to lead a religious life in reverent dependence on God for help would be a far more doubtful proof of conversion than would be furnished by some emotional ecstasy."

Again, on page 233, is this: "The emphasis on conversion as a turning toward God on the part of those who are turned away from him in lives of wickedness cannot be overdone; but the emphasis on conversion as a special emotional experience with striking psychological attendants is illiteracy both Scriptural and religious."

We give two other illustrations of his point of view. The first is on page 255.

"Love itself abides in the will rather than in the feeling, and its distinguishing mark consists in the set purpose to please and to serve. And this is true of our love for God. It is to be found in the consecration of the life and the devotion of the will; not in ebullitions of the sensibilities, but in the fixed purpose to please and serve. If along with this the heart should be 'strangely warmed,' there is no objection; but after all the root of the matter must be found in the life of devotion and service."

And then, the other, and last, on the next page. He is still discussing the idea of emotion as an attendant of the experience of conversion, and says:

"A frequent consequence of this error . . . is that the attention of the inquirer is diverted from the central and essential thing, the surrender of the will and life to God, and fixed upon having an experience. . . . Thus the volitional and ethical element, which is essential, is subordinated to a passive and emotional element, which in any case is only a non-essential attendant of religious consecration, and which in many cases is purely pathological."

The mistakes of Bowne's thinking are so numerous here, from the Christian point of view, that we are at a loss to know where to begin. In the first place no Christian leader ever stresses the emotional expectation, but always the faith act. Bowne ignores wholly the faith act, because he has no justification by faith in his system. He knows nothing but a God-assisted self-dedication to duty and service. But this is losing the New Testament and going back into the Old. But we cannot treat separately every mistake of the author in these quotations. Let us make a list of our criticisms, adding some brief, hasty comments, as we go along.

1. He repudiates the familiar distinction between the moral man and the saved man.

2. He grounds the need of conversion in acquired bad habits and false sets of the will, rather than in the natural depravity of the human life as Jesus said: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." It was not Nicodemus' acquired habits, but the spiritual inadequacy of nature's start that was wrong with him.

3. He locates love in the will; whereas every one knows that love is always an emotion before it can be a purpose of loyalty.

4. He belittles Wesley's experience of a heart strangely warmed in comparison with his purpose of consecration and obedience. And yet history

proves him false in this, for Wesley had had the purpose of loyalty through more than a decade of practical uselessness. But the incoming of emotion was in him the beginning of power.

5. He utterly misses the fact that at the heart of every powerful experience of conversion is a wonderful sense of the divine come near with all-sufficient pardoning grace. And whatever may be the Professor's abstract theories to the contrary this experience, either as an emotion, or as a metaphysical work deeper even than emotion, is mighty to the conquest of sin. The Christian centuries with one voice proclaim the distinction between human resolution, even resolution supported by certain prayers for assistance, and the mighty experience of regeneration.

6. As already said, he seems to be unconscious that the central emphasis of conversion is the act of self-abandoning faith. Hearts are not converted by self-consecration. The beginning of conversion is in an act of self-abandoning faith that cries out:

"Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee."

We conclude by frankly admitting the difficulty of our position, as venturing to urge severe criticism against one of the foremost philosophical minds of our times. But our defense is apparent. We have kept close to the Bible and the Christian centuries, from both of which Bowne departs. His Christianity is a product of his own unaided reason. From history he has accepted but two things, the divine Christ and the ethics and Kingdom of God. About these, by the power of his reason, he has built a religion that is nobler than Judaism by so much as the truth of Christ is grander than that of the prophets; but every sublimity of Historic Christianity is wanting in it. It is ethical monotheism with the figure of Christ in the centre as its chief teacher and supreme example. It is this and no more. It is utterly without value as a gospel for lost men who know in bitter experience the awful guilt and battle of sin. From Bowne's book such hearts will turn away with the cry of Magdalene at the sepulchre, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him."

Critical Notes on the "Shorter Bible"

BY PROFESSOR L. S. KEYSER, D.D., SPRINGFIELD, OHIO



NE should always try to be just and fair to those from whom one differs, no matter how vital the difference may be. Therefore, in giving an estimate of "The Shorter Bible" (Old Testament), edited by Charles Foster Kent, we shall begin by pointing out some of its fine qualities. In some ways it is a creditable work. With proper discrimination it might be adapted to do much good, especially in interesting people in the Holy Scriptures and making them attractive to persons who care more for compositions that are brightly written and easy to comprehend than for those that are more profound and thought-provoking. Had Dr. Kent and his collaborators called their work "Choice Selections from the Bible," and then treated the whole Bible as if it were the divinely inspired Word, they might have proved themselves real helpers to the cause of true religion.

The opening sentence of the preface is calculated to disarm criticism from evangelical scholars: "The Shorter Bible is not intended as a substitute for the complete text or the time-honored versions." We are glad for this statement. The preface continues: "It aims rather, through the selection of certain parts which have seemed especially well suited to this purpose, to kindle the interest of the busy reader in the Bible as a whole." This surely is a worthy motive, and should be borne in mind as we go along.

In spirit the same thing has been done many times before by evangelical writers—that is, they have set forth in modern language the chief historical

events and the most outstanding doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. The unique feature, therefore, about "The Shorter Bible" is that it professedly gives a translation directly from the Hebrew.

"In the Bible, accounts of the same events or teachings are frequently repeated," says the preface. Then the impression seems to be conveyed that this recension simply omits these duplicates and gives the connected narratives and teachings. Had this principle been faithfully carried out and the chronological order of the Bible preserved, no fault could have been found with the work.

To quote further: "In the translation the aim has been to translate the original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek idioms into their modern English equivalents—that is, to make it literal rather than literalistic, and to present the thought of the Biblical writers so simply that it can be easily understood by all."

Whether the translators have faithfully carried out this purpose remains to be seen; but they have certainly used idiomatic and graceful English, smooth and flowing, pellucid as a crystal brook, lively and interesting. In truly evangelical hands such a translation would indeed make the Bible a new book to many readers, and lead them to take a real interest in it. It might also win skeptics to faith in the Bible by showing them that the Biblical writers commanded a chaste and engaging style. Its literary qualities make a powerful apologetic for the genuineness and authority of the Bible.

Again, we admit that, if the parts of the Bible set forth in this work are true as history and doctrine, the great fundamental principles of the Christian religion must stand. You cannot accept these parts as true and discard the rest of the Bible. If they are inspired, then, as a logical consequence and inevitable conclusion, the rest of the Bible must also be inspired.

However, having said so much in praise of the work—and we have tried to say it ungrudgingly—we are in conscience bound to say that it has grave faults, some of which we must now proceed to survey. At the start attention should be called to the fact that Dr. Kent is famed as belonging to the liberalistic school of Biblical critics. All his numerous books prove that he trains with that school. It is a school that practically accepts the premises of those rationalistic critics, Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen, although in Great Britain and America many of its adherents decline to follow out those premises to their logical conclusions. They shred the Bible to bits by their critical processes, and yet want to hold on to it; thus their faith is *naïve*, not well-founded on fact and reason.

It is natural, therefore, that Dr. Kent's liberal views should color and shape his recension of the Bible; and that is precisely what they do; yes, from the first page to the last. One needs only to be on the alert, and to be familiar with the contentions and methods of the dissecting criticism, to see its earmarks protruding everywhere in this production.

Yet it is also true that some people may not detect the liberalistic views of the editors under the deft disguises. Nowhere is there a frank statement like this: "We print this section as a part of the Bible, but we do not believe it to be historical or divinely inspired." No; that impression is rather conveyed by hints and artfully chosen phrases. We are not questioning motives, but we greatly fear that the editors of this recension do not deal frankly with their readers.

To prove that Dr. Kent's position in regard to Christian theology is quite radical, we will cite a recent incident. Our quotation is from a reliable religious journal:

"Recently he gave a series of lectures to the students of the State Normal School at Emporia, Kans. They were of such a radical nature that the ministers of the town protested against them. Dr. Kent and the members of the ministerial association met in a public way for a 'give-and-take' meeting. Asked if he recognized the necessity for regeneration, he replied, 'If there is no degeneration, there will be no need for regeneration.' The question of the blood of Christ in our salvation was answered by this blasphemy: 'The blood was used only as a symbol. It might as well have been wool.' The ministerial association was right in saying to the president of the school: 'You should protect our young people instead of bringing a heretic here to talk to them'."

Is it not natural, then, that "The Shorter Bible" should take its theological hue, cue and atmosphere from the preconceptions of the editor-in-chief and his colleagues? This situation is precisely what we find in a critical examination of the work. The minds of its authors are pre-empted from the start. We try to be generous enough to admit that their chief motive is set forth in their preface, namely, a desire to make the Bible attractive and interesting; but we are further persuaded that another motive actuated them—that is, the desire to propagate the dissecting criticism of the Bible, which denies its plenary inspiration.

Let us now scrutinize the work with some care, by the method of exegesis and with just as little *eisegesis* as possible.

Suppose we begin with some of the captions of the various sections of the book. The first main division bears the significant title, "Stories and Histories." It includes all the inserted narratives from Genesis to Nehemiah. Do you sense the meaning of the word "stories" in this context? Note that "stories" are to be distinguished from "histories." If they mean the same thing, a rhetorical fault—that of tautology—has been committed by these fine literary experts in the very first heading they have used.

By every rule of interpretation, therefore, we must conclude that some of the Biblical narratives are only "stories," while others are "histories." By the same rule, the "stories" must be fictions, myths, legends, folk-lore, else they would not be differentiated from the "histories." Thus the liberalistic criticism of the Bible thrusts up its head slyly in the title of the very first major division.

But which parts are "stories" and which are "histories?" Deponent sayeth not, so far as this book is concerned. There are scores and scores of narratives from Genesis to Nehemiah; who shall discriminate the "histories" from the "stories?" You must read Kent's and Driver's critical books to find that out.

Does not this man-handling of the Bible endanger its divine inspiration and authority? Is it not a case of the old rationalism which leaves it to human judgment to decide which parts of the Bible are inspired and which are not? Small wonder that the editors of "The Shorter Bible" were so careful to say nothing about divine inspiration in their preface, which seems to be a piece of skillful dissembling.

It is pleasing to note that Genesis I in its entirety leads out in this translation. That is the place accorded to it in the authorized versions of the Bible. Thus we get started rightly with the history of revelation.

Still, we cannot help wondering whether this placement is consistent with the critical views held by the authors. According to those views, Gen. I belongs to P, and the P document was "composed in Babylon about 500 B. C." (*vide* Gray's "A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament," pp. 27 and 37). Of course, that was during the Babylonian captivity. Now, since for so-called historical and critical reasons these editors divide Exodus, Deuteronomy, Leviticus and Daniel, and transfer parts of them to post-exilic times, why did they place Genesis I at the beginning of the Bible? The only consistent explanation we can think of is that they regard the first chapter of the Bible as a mere "story," myth, legend, or bit of primitive folk-lore; and, of course, according to the theory of evolution, such flares of human imagination stand first in the annals of primitive races. The only inference is, therefore, that Gen. I is to be classed with the "stories."

The section from Gen. 1 to 11:1-9 is entitled "The Primitive Narratives." Here again we are puzzled. The word "primitive" is generally used by the critics to describe people in the lowest state of enlightenment. In what sense is the word employed here? The word "narratives" is also equivocal in the hands of the evolutionary champions, because we do not know whether they mean true or fictitious narratives.

And now we come upon a matter that will require somewhat detailed analysis. The first chapter of Genesis (including ch. 2:1-3) is called by these editors "The Poem of Creation." Why call it a "poem?" Why not call it

"The History of Creation?" Doubtless there are reasons. A poem is usually a flight of human imagination. Real, sober history, which scrupulously recites facts, is never, or at least very seldom, written in poetical form. Think of all the real histories of the world. Therefore, again the implication is that our authors look upon Genesis I as a fictitious writing, a "story." At the same time they seek to convey the impression that they admire it very much for its beautiful literary form. With one and the same deftly chosen word they both compliment and denature it. If it is only a flight of myth-loving fancy, what becomes of its inspiration? And if the creation did not take place according to the Genetical narrative, then how did the universe come into being? Nobody knows. Then the origin of things is wrapped in tantalizing obscurity. Then we do not even know whence the religion of Christ has sprung. Everything is left to human speculation and conjecture.

Moreover, in these days of negative criticism, to call Gen. I a "poem" may mean to class it with the far-famed Babylonian poem of creation and the Gilgamesh poem of the great flood. Indeed, many of the latitudinarians hold that the Biblical writers borrowed much of their material from those effusions of pagan imagination. They seem to be possessed by a kind of *furor* for making the Biblical narratives look just as much like the ethnic stories as possible, and thereby create the feeling in many people's minds that the Bible, too, may be largely, if not wholly, of only human origin.

However, no one's faith need be disturbed by some more or less obscure points of similarity between ethnic cosmogonies and the marvellous cosmogony of Biblical history; for the former are based upon and mixed up with all kinds of absurdities and superstitions, while the latter is sober, majestic, divinely given, and accords most wonderfully with true philosophy and science.

But was Gen. I really written and arranged in poetical form in the original Hebrew? That is the *crux* of the matter. We have taken the trouble to consult two expert Hebrew scholars, both of whom assure us that the original Hebrew of Gen. I is not written in metrical form, as blank verse would be, but in pure, simple, majestic prose.

One of our correspondents is Professor C. A. Blomgren, D. D., of Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill., who says: "You are right in your inference that higher critics and scientists prefer to call the Bible cosmogony of Gen. 1-2:3 a poem or song of creation in order to discredit it." At some future time we shall publish his whole letter, which is most interesting and informing.

True, the sentences in Gen. I are brief and terse, and therefore lend themselves somewhat easily to versicular arrangement; but to print them so in an English translation, as if that were their original form, is to misrepresent the Hebrew text and to convey a misleading impression. Beautiful prose is not poetry. We cite Addison, Hawthorne and Irving as witnesses. Poetry must have "verbal rhythm," says Stedman; must "move in rhythmic numbers. Words are not poetry till they reach a stress that is rhythmical." "A poet must be a versifier," observes Quackenbos ("Practical Rhetoric," p. 412). Judged by these tokens, Gen. I is not poetry.

But when you open "The Shorter Bible" at Gen. I, you find it printed in verse form. There is no consensus among Hebraists that the original is poetry, and therefore it is not right to represent it as if the matter were settled once for all. No; it is not ethical to treat a revered book like the Bible in this radical way.

And what is to be said of the poetical quality of Dr. Kent's translation? Of course, it is graceful prose; but let any reader who knows something about the technique of poetical construction try to *scan* Kent's lines; he will find it impossible; they are made up of a promiscuous mixture of poetical feet with no attempt at rhythmic order, no true metrical pulsations. They do not conform to the plain rules of prosody.

Dr. Kent's translation is beautiful prose, but it is not poetry, in spite of his attempt to put it in versicular form. Chaucer, Shakespeare, Lowell and Bryant never wrote blank verse after the Kent style. We have even done our

best to scan the Hebrew text both with and without the diacritical points, but find it impossible. The divinely inspired writer of the first Genetical narrative wrote in majestic prose, as became the greatness of his theme and in accord with the spirit of a veracious historian. His diction carries the atmosphere of verisimilitude.

For certain critical purposes the authors of "The Shorter Bible," whether consciously or unconsciously, have given a garbled translation of the first three verses of the Bible. Thus they start out badly. Every Hebrew scholar knows that these verses consist of six distinct sentences, all of them co-ordinate and connected by the conjunction "and" (Hebrew *va*). None are subordinate to any of the others. They follow one another consecutively, giving the impression that their author intended to recite events in their chronological order. But what do we find in this modern recension? Strange to say, the Hebrew is "doctored up." Words that are not in the original at all are run in, materially changing the sense. We quote, italicising the interpolated words:

"In the beginning *when* God created the heavens and the earth,
And *while* the earth was *still* unformed and chaotic,
With darkness on the surface of the deep,
And the spirit of God brooding over the waters,
God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light."

In the first line "when" is introduced, making the sentence a subordinate instead of an independent sentence. Many people will be led to think by Dr. Kent's translation that "when" is in the original, and therefore that all previous translations of the very first verse of the Bible have been erroneous. However, in the original Hebrew it stands thus in all its independent power and majesty: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," just as it should be in order to set forth without obscuration and diminution the fundamental doctrine of divine creation. How the force of the statement is weakened by inserting the conjunction "when," and subordinating the sentence to one that is so far down the column!

Why was this done by the translators? Was it with the intention of breaking the force of the positive statement of divine creation? In the second line "while" and "still" are interlarded. The Hebrew stands thus in its simple grandeur: "And the earth was formless and empty" (*bohu vatohu*); not "chaotic," for God never created chaos; He has always been a God of law and order. The third verse should read: "And the Spirit of God was brooding over the face of the waters." It is also an independent sentence in the Hebrew, and is the protasis of no other sentence. The last line should begin with "and" (*va*), just as all the preceding sentences do.

For a while we were mystified as to the motive that lay back of this mutilation of the Hebrew. Then we consulted Keil's great commentary on Genesis (which we would like to recommend to the attention of liberal as well as conservative scholars), and there we discovered the secret (p. 46). Two German rationalistic critics, Ewald and Bunsen, offered something like Dr. Kent's translation.

On this matter Dr. Keil says that the proposed translations are "opposed to the grammar of the language;" also "to the simplicity of style which pervades the whole chapter, and to which so involved a sentence would be intolerable." And why was this translation suggested by the German critics? Says Dr. Keil in reply: "This construction is invented for the simple purpose of getting rid of the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*, which is so repulsive to modern pantheism." Pardon! we do not mean to accuse the authors of "The Shorter Bible" of holding pantheistic notions, but we do say that their gloss on Gen. 1:1-3 puts them into bad critical and philosophical company, and there are some people who will be inclined to judge them accordingly.

There is another serious objection to the proposed construction of these three verses. Take them as they stand in the Hebrew, and they agree with the best science of our day, which teaches that there was a process of some duration after the creation of the primordial material, while the earth was being moulded into a condition that would make it a fit habitation for man. So there

may have been a process involving more or less time between the creation in the first verse and the fiat commanding light in the third verse. Surely the sentence, "And the Spirit of God was brooding over the face of the waters" (the fluid or nebulous mass), connotes a process requiring time. However, Kent's gloss, if you analyze it grammatically, makes all the events occur synchronously with the creation of the primordial material; and that puts the Biblical account in opposition to science.

We cannot help being impressed by the beauty of Kent's phrasing in his translation of Gen. I. At the same time the rhetoric is marred by the attempt to put prose composition in poetical form, with its uneven lines and its riot of metrical feet. Had he printed the chapter in majestic prose, translated it without gloss, and called it "The History of Creation," how much he might have done to establish confidence in the Bible! Alas that he did not do this! At Gen. 2:4 he drops into prose. Let the reader try to arrange this chapter in poetical lines, and he will see that it can be done with a little clever manipulation, just as Dr. Kent has done with the first chapter.

In the second chapter we discover another case of man-handling of the Hebrew text in the interest of the pre-empting documentary theory. The caption given to this chapter is, "Provisions for Man's Physical, Moral and Social Development." Note the order of the adjectives—"social" after "moral," so much in line with "modern" ideas; also observe that man's *spiritual* development is not mentioned; yet the chief feature of the garden experiences of our first parents was their intimate relation to God.

Sad to say, "modern" men seem to have a special *penchant* for crowding God into the background. Not so the Bible; hence they miss the spirit and atmosphere of that holy Book. But how has the Hebrew text been man-handled in this chapter by our recensionists? After verse 4 the Hebrew text uses the double name, Jehovah Elohim, whereas in the first chapter only Elohim is employed. But Kent uses only Jehovah throughout this chapter, omitting Elohim. Why is this? The explanation is found in Driver's "Book of Genesis" (p. 37): "It is usually supposed that in 2:4-3:24 the original author wrote simply *Jehovah*; and that *God* (Elohim) was added by the compiler, with the object of identifying the Author of Life of 2:4-25 with the Creator of Chap. 1."

And so Kent actually omits the word Elohim from his version of the Bible, prepared especially for popular and family reading, on such slender evidence as that! Thus the Bible is manipulated and mutilated in the interest of a preconceived theory.

Can it be that Dr. Kent and his colleagues have never read Dr. A. H. Finn's acute and masterly book, "The Unity of the Pentateuch," published in 1914 (second edition)? This book was awarded the first prize by the Council of the Victoria Institute "as the best book of the kind published in the last three years." In what cloister have the critics immured themselves, anyway? With convincing force and great technical scholarship Dr. Finn shows how illy based and conjectural is the whole theory of the Jehovist and Elohist documents.

The negative critics can claim no ethical justification for continuing to proclaim their "assured results," since such scholars as Orr, Cave, Green, Moeller, McKim, Finn, and many others just as capable have shown those conclusions to be anything but "assured." Is it right, we ask in all kindness and earnestness, for them to ignore all opposition to their theories? Is pride of opinion an ethical quality?

There is also a serious gloss in Kent's rendition of Gen. 2:4, in the interest of the rationalizing criticism, which tries to make out a case of contradiction between the accounts of Gen. 1 and 2. But we will not tarry; we simply refer the reader to the complete answers given in Orr's "The Problem of the Old Testament," Green's "The Unity of Genesis," Keil's Commentary, Raven's "Old Testament Introduction," and Finn's "The Unity of the Pentateuch."

The authors of "The Shorter Bible" are to be commended for giving so full an account of the interesting experiences of Adam and Eve in the garden and of their fall into sin. But in their preface they seem to indicate that only

the repetitions of the Bible are to be omitted in their abridgment. However, we find that they omit the entire history of the antediluvians from Cain to Noah. No mention is made of Seth or of the Seth line; no mention of Enoch, who "walked with God, and was not, for God took him." Why this omission? It cannot be said to be a duplicate, for this history is given nowhere else in the Bible. Here many centuries of Bible history are passed over in silence. You read of Cain, and then you come abruptly upon the many wicked people whom God determined to destroy with the flood. Where did all those people come from? What was the course of human history during that long interim? This omission is a serious defect for people who desire to get a connected historical survey.

"The Survival of the Morally Fit," is the title of the narrative of the Noachian deluge. This expression gives a squint toward the theory of evolution. "The Traditional Origin of Nations and Languages" is the heading prefixed to the narrative of the tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues. The word "traditional" is meant to convey the idea that this narrative is not historical. How can these authors be so sure of that? They ought to be very, very sure before they try to undermine people's faith in the historicity of the Bible.

We pass on to Jacob, who certainly gets a bad character from the authors of "The Shorter Bible." If you were to take merely the headlines (to our mind, they are in newspaper fashion), you would receive the impression that God made a very poor choice in selecting Jacob to carry forward His plan of redemption.

The first caption is, "Jacob's Trickery in the Home;" but mark you! there is no "scare" headline calling attention to Esau's banality and wickedness in selling his birthright for a mess of pottage. The real point in the incident is missed by the misleading subject heading.

Next Jacob receives a black eye by the caption, "Jacob's Unscrupulous Ambition." His desire to secure what God had promised him is entirely ignored by such traduction.

Then comes "The Dream of a Troubled Fugitive." Why was it not made "Jacob's Vision of God and Heaven?" That is the chief point of the event. There is no proof that it was Jacob's perturbed conscience that caused the dream; therefore the title given by these translators is a misconstruction.

Next, "The Deceiver Deceived" seems to be the thing that bulked largest in the minds of the "redactors."

"Trickery that Again Made Jacob a Fugitive" is the lamming poor Jacob receives in the next section.

Then comes "Facing the Misdeeds of His Youth."

This is the way Jacob, the servant of God, is maligned and painted blacker than he was. How he wrestled with God and won the victory, how his name was changed to Israel, how God appeared to him and guided him, and promised to make him the father of a great people—all these more spiritual facts do not appear in these "scare" headlines. The spiritual atmosphere is absent; the human and carnal are made most conspicuous.

Even Joseph is called "The Victim of Favoritism," with Jacob chiefly to blame again; while the fact is that he was much more "the victim" of the wicked envy of his brothers. Not for a moment do we mean to condone Jacob's duplicity; but to paint one of God's chosen instruments so black will surely do harm. It is the course of providential history, preparatory to redemption through Jacob's seed, in spite of human infirmity, that is the paramount purpose of those Biblical narratives. True Bible scholars will try to bring out that thought.

The Joseph narratives are presented in a captivating style in this translation, and with a fullness of which no one need complain. The same may be said of the histories of Moses' early life, the Egyptian plagues, Israel's deliverance from bondage, and the wilderness journeyings. Of course, there may be glosses and defects in these sections, but space will not permit too many details for the present.

We pass on to some other books of the Bible. The book of *Exodus* is twisted to make it coincide with the divisive theories. The events are followed in the Biblical order to the fifteenth chapter; after which there is much manipulation in the interest of critical preconceptions. In section 42 appear selections from Chapters 15, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 24 (only verse 34 of the last chapter is given); in section 43 the excerpts oscillate thus: Chapters 25, 35, 36 and 33; in section 44 they swing back to Chapter 18, and in 45 to Chapters 16 and 17. Such arbitrary methods make a jargon of the Bible, and will not create confidence in its integrity. Thus much for certain parts of *Exodus*.

Now let us turn over 230 pages of our book, and what do we find? Why, here (pp. 326-329), after *Nehemiah*, appear several excerpts from *Exodus* (parts of Chapters 21-23), torn entirely out of their place in the Biblical narrative. Thus are the minds of the authors preoccupied by a theory.

But note: according to the Bible, the laws in Chapters 21-23 were spoken by Jehovah directly to Moses at Mount Sinai (let the reader consult *Ex. 20:22ff*, and see for himself); according to Kent and his associates, they were given after the Babylonian exile over a thousand years later by whom and to whom nobody knows.

Is such treatment of the sacred Book calculated to inspire confidence and "to kindle the interest of the busy modern reader in the Bible as a whole?"

Deuteronomy is dealt with in the same radical way. Parts of Chapters 1, 8, 28, 31, 34, are placed in the Biblical position after *Numbers*, while a large part of the book is transferred to a place after *Nehemiah*. Not a line of *Leviticus* appears in its proper place, but several citations occur after *Nehemiah*, and hence are represented as post-exilic. But according to the Bible God gave all the Levitical laws to Moses during the pilgrimage from Egypt to Canaan. Will such handling of the Bible inspire confidence in its inspiration and authority? Do the critics ever ask themselves that momentous question?

What treatment is accorded to *Daniel* by the authors of this modern recension? The historical part (Chapters 1-6, or parts of them) is inserted immediately after 2 *Kings*, where it properly belongs, and we are glad to note that the miracles are not omitted. Then you must turn back through *Ezra*, *Nehemiah* and all the prophets, including *Jonah* (pp. 294-449), and there you will find a brief excerpt from this great prophet, under the title, "The Ultimate Vindication of the Upright" (Chapters 7:1-18 and 12:2, 3). Thus the prophecies attributed to *Daniel* in our Bibles were never uttered or written by him, but by some one long after his time; yet *Daniel* was the prophet to whom Christ appealed so impressively in forecasting the destruction of Jerusalem.

But we cannot now pursue our analysis further. Before we close, we are moved to make a few suggestions pertaining to the question of "scholarship," of which the liberalists make so much boast.

There is Professor J. W. McGarvey's book, "The Authorship of *Deuteronomy*." Did the authors of this translation never read that work? It completely vindicates (at least, in our estimation) the conservative view of *Deuteronomy*, and smashes the documentary hypothesis. The book appeared already in 1902. The critics may scoff at the book, but have they ever examined it carefully, or made an attempt to refute its arguments?

More recently (1911) Rev. J. S. Griffith came out with a searching critique of higher critical theories in his book, "The Problem of *Deuteronomy*." Have the liberalists never read that book?

Another book must not be omitted—President Samuel C. Bartlett's "The Veracity of the Hexateuch" (1897), which is a powerful defense of the historic character of the first six books of the Bible. To our mind, the arguments are unanswerable; yet, judged by circumstantial evidence, Dr. Kent and his company never heard of this excellent treatise.

And here, before us, lies Dr. A. H. Finn's remarkable work, keen and cutting as a Damascus blade, "The Unity of the Pentateuch" (1914, second edition). Are the liberal critics aware of this book? Have they ever considered its argumentation in a frank and open spirit?

No less effective is Dr. John Howard Raven's "Old Testament Introduc-

tion, General and Special" (1910, second edition). We are amazed (no, that is not too strong a word) that the critics have ignored so able a work. For college and seminary classes we would recommend the displacement of the books of Kent, Sanders, Bade, and Peritz with Dr. Raven's scholarly text.

Then there is "The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia," with its array of Biblical scholars, who have written so well and so convincingly on all the books of the Bible and on every phase of Biblical criticism. Have the critics taken stock of this monumental work? Or do they not care? Are they unwilling to consider the other side of this paramount problem?

Men must be careful not to mistake mere *aplomb* for scholarship. Is a man a real scholar who will not study all sides of a question? We feel persuaded that, if Dr. Kent and his helpers had carefully considered the above-mentioned works, they never would have man-handled and mutilated the Bible as they have done in their version. We do not believe that their consciences would have permitted it.

Dr. Kent and his associates hack Isaiah to pieces. The unity of the book is entirely destroyed. For example, Chapter 6 comes first, while Chapter 1 comes fourteen pages later in another section. A large part of the book is placed after Habakkuk, and hence was not composed until near the close of the exile, over 150 years after Isaiah lived. The "Deutero-Isaiah" theory is accepted without question by these authors, as if it were settled once for all and forever. How confusing to simple people this shredding of the Bible will be, and how disturbing to their faith! The authors of "The Shorter Bible" had no moral right to represent their positions as finally established, in the face of the many competent evangelical scholars who have at least shown them to be without a secure foundation.

In view of the tremendous assumptions of the critics, it will not be "carrying coals to Newcastle" to remind them of the cogent works of some conservative scholars: J. Kennedy's "A Popular Argument for the Unity of Isaiah" (1891); G. Douglas's "Isaiah One and His Book One" (1895); D. S. Margoliouth's "Lines of Defense of the Biblical Revelation," and his article in "The Temple Dictionary" (1910); Sinker's "Hezekiah and His Age;" John H. Raven's "Old Testament Introduction" (1910); R. B. Girdlestone's "The Building Up of the Old Testament" (1912); George L. Robinson's "The Book of Isaiah" (1910), and also his elaborate article in "The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia" (1915). Dr. L. W. Munhall is sometimes rather caustic in his methods, but it would be profitable for the partitioning critics to read the chapter on Isaiah in his book entitled, "The Highest Critics Versus the Higher Critics" (1896, fifth edition).

As to the book of Daniel, we feel sure that Dr. Kent and his associates never would have treated it so shabbily had they given proper attention to John Urquhart's "The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scriptures," published in 1895. Too old? Out of date? But Urquhart answered even in his day the very contentions of the present-day critics, like Gray, Bacon, McFadyen, Kent, Rice, and the rest. So far as we can see, they have brought in no new evidence and no new arguments. They have simply distinguished themselves as repeaters.

But we do not need to go back so far as Urquhart. Surely Dr. Kent should have some acquaintance with Dr. Robert Dick Wilson's recent work (1917), "Studies in the Book of Daniel," wherein he proves, by a refinement of logical argument and an array of scholarship never equalled in that special field, that the book of Daniel is Daniel's own book and that his prophecies were inspired of God. And yet, regardless, Dr. Kent went right ahead and cut Daniel in two and assigned his prophecies to a date long after Daniel's time. Such, sad to say, are the "ways" of the critics. Verily, as some one suggests, there are "critics who cannot see the facts for their theories."

On the whole matter, we are by no means persuaded that fragmentary translations of the Bible are what the people ought to have. It would be better, we are disposed to think, to give a translation of the whole Bible in modern language, without gloss, or reconstruction, or transposition, and then let read-

ers judge of its merits for themselves. It is not too large a book for use. Its repetitions are often impressive and emphatic. People ought to read the harder parts of the Holy Scriptures both for mental and spiritual discipline, and not confine themselves to the easy portions. And we wonder whether the difficult parts are not the very parts that have most need of being put in lucid and attractive vernacular. Do we want to have superficial and anemic Christians? Would it not be better to cultivate a virile Christianity to meet the demands of these stressful times?

Editorial

The Present Situation



RANKNESS is always desirable. It is not well to tell a man that his grandfather was a villain and was hanged at the yard arm, even if such was the fact; but it is well to show your colors with courage and honesty and tell the truth.

Now, the situation with respect to the CHAMPION ought to be understood. In 1917, war conditions forced Dr. Hamilton to cut down the magazine to a Bimonthly or stop altogether. He cut it down. Mr. Boyer was publishing a Homiletic monthly, and it was solvent.

The two were consolidated; but the change required of Mr. Boyer cost him a large part of his subscription list, because the ministers did not care for the official organ of the Bible League, which the CHAMPION was, and preferred a Homiletic periodical. The CHAMPION could not well be both, and Mr. Boyer loyally made the changes needed to conform to the requirements of the Board. He also restored the monthly issue and faced the deficit with his own funds.

To date that deficit has remained vigorous and healthy. The CHAMPION, in the three and a half years that have elapsed, has cost him over \$5,000.00; but he has never winced, and he has given his time besides.

Dr. Hamilton was to lecture and push the magazine from coast to coast in the interest of the Bible League; but he was stricken down with influenza, and he never recovered from its effects. Mr. Boyer agreed to finance the publication till it became self-supporting; but that outcome has never arrived, in part because of the fact that no one has been found to do the work Dr. Hamilton had in hand and make the thing possible.

Meanwhile, every effort has been made to improve the periodical, and all are agreed that those efforts have been abundantly successful. If the Bible League of North America is to amount to anything, it needs an official organ. That is a self-evident proposition, and if the friends of the Bible are real friends of the cause they will stand by that league and help it to maintain an efficient organ. Are they doing it? Well, hardly!

In one way and another they have let their subscriptions fall behind, until the present slough has been reached. Honestly, how would you like it to send out bills for \$4,500.00 and get responses from only a small number of those involved? That is what happened with the November number.

Do you know that over 200 missionaries are waiting to get the CHAMPION when Mr. Boyer can afford to send it to them? He cannot do so and continue to supply you gratis. Do you think he ought to do both? There are also seminaries and colleges to which the League wishes to send it; but that cannot be done at present. Many Y. M. C. A.'s would receive it too, if it was only paying its way. Moreover, a lot of these people want it but cannot afford it now.

Is that your trouble? If so, why not be frank enough to tell Mr. Boyer and not rub discouragement into him by your neglect. He did not drop you, because some objected to that and expressed their intention to pay up later. Were you among them? If so, you have unconsciously been doing a lot of harm and making a lot of trouble for other people.

If a thousand persons owed you a dollar and a half apiece, and you could not get them to take any notice of the obligation by your politest suggestion that they pay up, what would you think of them? Would you admire their Christian character? Honestly, now, would you? How about him and yourself? It costs money to keep books and send out bills, and doing it means just so much less cash available for publication and distribution. Had you thought of that?

Do you realize what you have been getting for a dollar and a half? By actual calculation, not mere guess work, the 1921 CHAMPION contained about 38,000 words per number, or approximately 456,000 words. Another periodical, which averaged something like 47,000 words per number but had only four issues, cost its subscribers three dollars. It had in all less than 190,000 words so that relatively you got 456 words for your money to their 95 words, dropping ciphers.

Now, if you multiply 95 by four and a half, you will get less than 428, so that it is safe to say that you got four and a half times as much reading matter as they did for your cash—if you paid it. Did you? As a matter of fact, counting in empty spaces such as the CHAMPION always lacks, you really got approximately five times as much to read as they did.

It is true that the other publication has an international reputation; but some of its contributors have been writing for the CHAMPION too and doing it gladly. They are scholars, and they are Christians, and they want to help you. They study and weigh things before they say anything, and they know whereof they speak. If they did not, they never could have placed a paper in that other publication. It was an indispensable requisite.

They use good books such as "The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia," and they study them. This work contains the critical views, it is true: but its editors were all conservatives, and they furnish the answer to the critical views along with them and show what the truth probably is. That is the best way to do, and it is really the only fair way.

The editors are working for nothing and giving you of their best, because they believe that the Bible is the only cure for a sin-sick world, that Jesus was not an ordinary man but God manifest in the flesh, that He died that you might live, that He rose again, that He has work for them to do, and that no man is competent to work in the Kingdom without the guidance of the Holy Spirit in his own daily life.

They recognized, however, that men are fallible and that even the most pious may misrepresent and misconstrue the Word and make it appear ridiculous to men who have learning but not piety, and they long to meet a need that such a situation plainly produces. Moreover, they are honest, just as Job was, and they refuse to be dishonest for the purpose of appearing more pious. What would you do in their place? Would you be dishonest? Would God approve of that?

Now, then, what can you do to help? If you are a subscriber, you can pay your subscription promptly. If you are not, you can become one or pay for the copy of some one who cannot afford it. In any case, you can boost and not kick. You may not like some things; but you can at least remember that there is an even chance that a man who has given his life to study and to the interpretation of difficult texts knows as much about the point as you do with only snap judgment to guide you.

Come on. Come across and do your bit and help us make the CHAMPION it. We are trying to plan some way to improve its ease of reading. We are studying how to make it the best it has ever been. We are showing our faith by our works and trusting you to do likewise. Will you do it like a good sport or will you just sulk and nurse some fancied injury for which there is not a particle of real justification? What would a real man or woman do?—H. W. M.

* * *

All that I have taught of art, everything that I have written, whatever greatness there has been in any thought of mine, whatever I have done in my life, has simply been due to the fact, when I was a child, my mother daily read with me a part of the Bible, and daily made me learn a part of it by heart.—John Ruskin.

Russellism



HIS cult has in its makeup considerable modernism but not enough to prevent its having a classification of its own. It is a compound of some truth with much error. The man who stands at the head of this cult is the late Charles Taze Russell, author, lecturer and minister. He gave himself the title, Pastor Russell. He had a remarkable career and a large following. The articles in his "Watch Tower," a semi-monthly publication, were written almost exclusively by himself and are said to have had a circulation of seventy-five thousand in New York and Brooklyn alone, and were published in five different languages. It is claimed that his pamphlets and books had more than fifteen million readers. There were published of his book entitled "About Hell," nearly three million copies and nearly five million of his "Divine Plan of the Ages." Other of his writings are said to have been translated into thirty-five different languages. His sermons were handled by a newspaper syndicate that controls two thousand newspapers with a circulation among another fifteen million readers. His words therefore had a larger circulation every week than those of any other living man in this or any other country, in this or any other age. He was an independent worker, a free lance as we should say, and his announced purpose was to reach not only Protestants, but Catholics, Jews and Free-Thinkers; in fact, all classes. His nominal salary was eleven dollars per month. His work was carried on financially by voluntary contributions from personal friends and from those who believed or were pleased with his teaching. He never allowed himself a vacation and left no estate when death ended his laborious career. He died away from home, on a railway train, October 31, 1916, at sixty-four years of age, while on a lecture tour through our Southern and Western States. Such were the life work and death of Pastor Russell.

We hope to be pardoned for this rather extended notice of Pastor Russell; it is prompted in part by the fact that the author has had for him a measure of personal sympathy growing out of a similarity in an early religious experience. It was an eclipse of faith by reason of unwise religious teaching. This was followed in both his case and in that of the author by an era of downright scepticism. But later upon a re-examination of Bible revelation our paths diverged. In the author's case orthodoxy became sane and solidly scientific and philosophical, while Pastor Russell's teachings became such that we have been led to enumerate some of them as being among the most unorthodox and dangerous theories of the present day. His views have some features of attractiveness that made them popular. He advocated the worship of Jehovah and believed the Bible to be a divine book. His mistakes grew out of his faulty and unscholarly methods of interpretation. His opinion as to the Lord Jesus Christ was altogether unorthodox. He taught that Christ before His advent and while on earth was human. His body did not rise from the grave but may have turned into gas. Russellism denies the deity, incarnation, resurrection, ascension and intercession of Christ. Pastor Russell had nothing to say of the mission and work of the Holy Spirit. His teaching as to the future of the sinner is equally unorthodox. Some of the wicked dead will be raised and "made perfect and innocent like Adam before he fell; other sinners will have a second chance"; "the more wicked men have been in this life the more likely they will be, through the experience of sin, to be saved by the gospel of a second chance"; "those who accept the second chance will have life everlasting"; "those who do not want to live forever will have the privilege of being asphyxiated in a lake of fire"; the finally impenitent, that is, the incorrigible, are "extinguished at death and annihilated sometime hereafter."

In Rutherford's biographical sketch is the following quotation from Pastor Russell: "A God who would use his power to create human beings whom he foreknew and predestinated to be eternally tormented could be neither wise, just, nor loving."

Another one of his officials writes that "Pastor Russell was a most strenuous opponent of the hell of eternal torment. According to his creed, whatever hell

there may be will pass away and there will be an end of all pain, death and sorrow, in case of both saint and sinner."

Pastor Russell taught that man has a soul, or rather is a soul, but is not immortal. He taught that the death of the body carries along with it the death of the soul unless released through a "ransom price" provided by Christ's atonement, and that man in order to be saved by the ransom price must be consecrated to God and His service. Pastor Russell taught that there would be a millennial reign of Christ for a thousand years and that some time during those years all men, saints and sinners, will be awakened from sleep to a conscious life. Sinners then will have a second probation, or a second chance to reform.

During several years of his early ministry Pastor Russell predicted with great assurance that the millennial reign of Christ would begin during the autumn of 1874; that was forty-seven years ago. He was self-consistent in this, that he kept on preaching that Christ began his millennial reign in that year. But one may well wonder if Pastor Russell were to witness the conditions now existing—the unholy strife, the selfish ambition, with honesty, purity, sanctity and religion laughed at and ignored by multitudes, with a pall of perplexity, strife and misery settling down over the whole world—yes, one may well wonder if witnessing these conditions Pastor Russell would still claim that the millennium had come and that Satan is chained.

It is not altogether easy accurately to characterize Russellism. We are sure, however, that it is unphilosophical, unscientific, unscriptural, and a perversion of New Testament theology. It has been represented as a combination of Unitarianism, Universalism, Restorationism, Second Probationism, Swedenborgianism and Annihilationism.

Pastor Russell was accustomed to denounce foreign missions. Also the creeds of every orthodox church, and all clergymen who did not agree with him. In this respect he was one of the most uncharitable of men.

"Tell me what a man thinks and I will tell you what he will do," is a maxim based upon general observation which finds a sad illustration in Pastor Russell. Shadows, two or three of them, rest upon his memory. He falsely represented himself as a competent Bible student and exegete, but it was shown in the *Brooklyn Eagle* suit, December 9, 1912, that he had no knowledge of Hebrew, or of Greek, or of Latin; that he never had taken a course in philosophy or in systematic theology, and never had graduated from any high school of learning; that he never passed an examination before any ecclesiastical body and never was ordained to the ministry. Nor is this the worst of it. In 1879 he married Miss Marie F. Ackley, spoken of as a most estimable woman, who divorced him a few years ago on the ground of cruelty and of having wrong relations with other women. In court, improprieties were proved between Pastor Russell and Miss Rose Ball. On one occasion his wife found him locked in a room with a servant girl named Emily Matthews. These facts and others of a financial character were published in the *Brooklyn Eagle*, also in a pamphlet by the Rev. J. I. Ross, of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. It also was charged by the *Brooklyn Eagle* that Pastor Russell, by misrepresentations, had been defrauding his wife out of her dower. These charges were so damaging that he was urged by his friends to bring suit against both the *Eagle* and Mr. Ross. He did so, but in both instances the courts decided against him. The case as to the paying of alimony he fought for five years, appealing it twice. On the third trial he not only lost his case but the alimony was increased and all costs levied upon him. Under oath he made this confessions: "I am a jelly fish. I float around here and there; I touch this one and that one, and if she responds I take her to myself, and if not I float on to others."

Such is the man who had an immense following and who taught his people that there is no hell, no demons and no punishment for sinners. It is nothing strange that such a man should disbelieve in the doctrine of hell and demons.

How can his success be accounted for? is a question very naturally asked. No great difficulty is in the way of finding an answer, which is this: Pastor Russell had more than ordinary natural ability; he was a most energetic worker and was immensely conceited. Let such a man be boldfaced, pretending to know

the revelations of the Bible better than almost any one else, and let him assure those who know they are sinners that they have nothing to fear in the future, that there is no hell, and that ultimately there will be even for incorrigible sinners nothing worse than a wished for non-existence—let a man of some intellectual ability preach with the utmost assurance such views and he will have a following, at least for a time, that will outdistance that of the average orthodox preacher. Such teachings as these suit unbelievers, and so rich sinners became Pastor Russell's chief financial supporters.

All things considered, therefore, it need occasion no surprise that Pastor Russell met with remarkable success, such as it was; and one discovers also why he abandoned orthodoxy and was left to believe a lie.

But on the other hand, if he had believed what the Bible clearly teaches, and had acted up to that belief, his achievements in some respects would have been, none the less, the good he would have done might have been vastly greater, and there would have been no such clouds as those that will forever rest upon his name and reputation. It is clear, therefore, that he must be classed among the most unsafe, if not among the most unworthy, of religious teachers.

The impression, however, should not be left that Russellism died with the death of its founder. There is still a following; the leading representative at the present time is Judge J. F. Rutherford, who is president of "The Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society," that was founded by Pastor Russell.

In recent lectures given before large audiences the Judge faithfully affirms the teachings of his predecessor.

At a recent meeting in Boston held in the National Theatre that was filled to its utmost capacity the judge, while speaking of the end of the world, made this Russellian prediction:

"It can now be positively announced that millions living on earth will never die. Because the world has ended, the old order is rapidly passing and the new order is coming in. As 1914 is a date definitely fixed (a prediction as to the world war), so is 1925 another date definitely fixed. The world having ended and the reconstruction being due to begin in 1925, without doubt there are millions now living on earth who will still be living then. The time is coming when the old man will be restored to youth, bald heads will disappear, and all the imperfections of mankind will vanish. When that time comes we won't need doctors; undertakers will have to hunt for another job and drug stores will have no further use. The population will be used to beautify the earth. The Lord will put the whole human race to work, but there won't be any labor unions, or any profiteers, or any clergymen. The whole human race will be lifted up from sickness, sorrow, and death, to the day of youth."

Russellism will continue to have a following so long as men dislike those doctrines of Bible Christianity that have any thing to say about hell and demons, and so long as they seek in some way to escape the responsibilities of a selfish and sinful life. And Russellism will continue to have its advocates even after Judge Rutherford shall have followed Pastor Russell into the unexplored and invisible world to which all are hastening and where the truth will be known.

What conclusion, therefore, can be reached other than this: If the teachings of Pastor Russell, whose name is beclouded, are true, then those of Christ—"the Adorable One"—are false; and if Christ's teachings are true, then those of Pastor Russell are false. And if his teachings are false then an astonishing and overwhelming disappointment on the day of judgment when the books are opened, must await those who have been led astray by this cult called Russellism.

Accounting for all Facts



INTELLECTUAL honesty is said to be the rarest thing in the world. It certainly looks that way at times. Thus, a story is told of a geologist who had traveled about a thousand miles to see certain interesting rocks. He was nearly there when he met another geologist on his way home from the same place. He inquired what the latter thought of the formation and was told: "It is the best evidence of the igneous theory of rock-formation that I have ever seen." The geologist went no further. He turned about and went sadly home. He was an advocate of the aqueous theory of rock-formation and could not afford to see any such evidence!

It happens that both theories are needed to account for all the facts; but men do not stop to consider such possibilities. They adopt some narrow view of things and then try to force everything to conform to that view. It cannot be done. Moreover, it leads to what may justly be called bigotry, unless one prefers to believe that such persons are either dishonest or hypocrites. As the chances are all against these latter possibilities, the other horn of the dilemma is the only one that it is safe to take.

Now, this form of bigotry is found among scientists as well as among other men. They, too, leave out some of the facts. Studying comparative anatomy, a most fascinating thing, by the way, men like Chas. Darwin developed the modern doctrine of evolution, which amounts to little more than an elaboration of the teachings of Leucippus, a Greek philosopher born nearly five hundred years before Christ. They saw the body and saw it large.

In a general way their theories are rational enough, so long as the body is all that is involved; but they utterly break down as soon as the human will is encountered, as Dr. Thomson has shown in his "Brain and Personality." That will is what makes a man a man, and their theory goes to pieces as a result, unless they reduce it to a portion of a divine process which is not evolution. It may be that God did employ some such method as they imagine. It was not evolution, however, because that leaves Him out altogether.

It is never safe to leave out any part of the facts. On a Sunday in December a prominent clergyman of an orthodox denomination preached on the virgin birth. He took the ground that, while he personally believed in the virgin birth, such a belief was not necessary to a saving Christian faith. What was necessary was a belief in the divinity of Christ. It never dawned on his mentality that the two things are indissolubly connected, and that giving up a belief in the virgin birth necessarily destroys a belief in Christ's divinity.

When keen witted free thinkers encounter such reasoning, they promptly say—such men never mince words—that men advocating that sort of thing are either hypocrites or fools, and the worst of it is that they can make out a fairly good case! It is either virgin birth or bastardy, and bastardy is no foundation for divinity!

The statement that Joseph was not the father of Jesus is as clear and explicit as words can make it. Likewise the statement that he thought of putting Mary away because of her condition. The Jews, then and now, knew and know him as "Jesus the bastard." That is made clear enough by the records found in the Talmud and the "Toldoth Jeshu." Modern Jews so know him, as one of them told me. He was intended for a rabbi and knows whereof he speaks. They have never had any misapprehensions on the subject and have never accepted his divinity.

That involves one of two things—being more than a man or less. If Jesus was merely human—and a bastard—he could not become divine without ceasing to be a man, because his own will and therefore his ego, or self, would have to be disposed of first. If this were not true, we should have had many others as divine as he was. Witness such men as Dwight L. Moody and Gypsy Smith. Without free will there can be no manhood and no temptations.

On the other hand, if he was not merely human but had a human mother and in place of a father had the Holy Ghost, then there can be no abrogation of his free will no matter how completely the Spirit may dominate him, because it is merely an election on his part to develop the father personality in him. We all do that sort of thing ourselves, and none of us ceases to be free in doing it. The process is nothing more than the development of innate characteristics. Christ, then, must have been more than a man or he was not divine. There is no way of escaping from the dilemma, and he was divine. Otherwise, his life is an utterly unaccountable phenomenon. It is a greater miracle than any which the rationalists labor so hard to get rid of.

One more illustration must suffice. Men are divided on the subject of inspiration. Some claim that every word and thought and idea of the Bible is inspired. That is the so-called plenary inspiration. Others hold that the Bible is not the word of God, but that it contains the word of God. Curiously enough the two schools rely on the same identical passages to substantiate their claims!

Both are equally narrow, and neither takes into consideration all the facts. Be-

sides these, there are "verbal inspiration," "moral inspiration," "dynamical inspiration," and "mechanical inspiration." Some of these overlap more or less, but all are recognized as definite doctrines in one way or another.

The truth contains elements from all of them. A perfectly sane theory of verbal inspiration is possible, and it will allow for the patent fact that the writers of the Scriptures retain their own personalities and limitations. Thus, the author of Hebrews says (ii. 5): "But one hath somewhere testified, saying, What is man," etc. The passage is from the eighth Psalm. Paul says (I Cor. x. 8): "Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand." The actual number (Numb. xxv. 9) was twenty-four thousand. Paul depended upon his memory. Exact agreement in all such minutiae would go to prove the Scriptures a forgery, because men of that day trusted to their memories and did not consult documents or try to be perfectly accurate.

All writers of Scriptures were guided in their efforts. All were kept from errors that were of any importance. All were allowed to be themselves and do as they naturally would. All were verbally inspired wherever it was necessary or a part of God's purpose. Some of them, perhaps all of them, heard what was the equivalent of voices uttering words conveying definite instructions. How it was done we cannot tell; but that it was done I, for one, firmly believe. At the time her mother died, my wife was anxious for her aunt to be there. I sat by the bed. I heard no sound; but on my inner consciousness an impression was made like the voice, inflection, and words of her deceased "Aunt May," saying, "Louise will be here when Sarah goes." She was. The whole form, inflection,—everything—was "Aunt May's," and it was wholly different from my own. That helps me to understand.—H. W. M.

What Did It ?



N a certain parish was a man whose character, such as it was, and whose cussedness were phenomenal. That is not a nice way to put it; but the writer conceives no other so accurate and adequate form of expression that fits him.

He had had a godly and devoted mother, had been baptized in infancy, and had been religiously trained. But a Gallic strain in his blood, it is alleged, led to an eccentricity of career that was remarkable. He would do strange things, in ways and at times most unexpected. He would, for example, be walking the street with you, when suddenly he would spring into the air, yell like a Comanche Indian, turn a complete somersault, light on his feet in step with you, and continue the conversation just as though nothing had happened.

Early in life his wanderlust set him traveling around the world, and he visited almost every country and clime. He claimed to have been a sharp observer of missionaries and mission fields, and he saw what the non-Christian tramp wants to see. He returned a blatant blasphemer, an insufferable infidel, and a detestable drunkard. Religion had become a thing to be remorselessly ridiculed; Christ was an object of contempt; missionaries were his *bete noir*; and his uncircumcised tongue could find no phrase offensive enough to fully express his mind in regard to ministers and churches.

His wife, a refined and most excellent Christian woman, was a devoted and efficient member of the Presbyterian church; but that he would ever enter a church seemed outside the possibilities.

A young minister succeeded to the pastorate of that church, and for some reason unaccountable to him, that man, as they became acquainted, seemed to have a kindly regard for him, and this feeling would once in a while lead him to go with his family to church. He once said to the pastor in a friendly way: "I don't believe one word you say in your sermons, but I believe in you, for I am confident that you yourself believe what you say, and you live it." After that, when the preacher thought he had something specially adapted to this goat in his flock, he would convey to him, either personally or by some one else, an invitation to come to church, which was generally accepted, and the message would be respectfully, albeit sometimes very uncomfortably, received.

One day the minister came out from a place of business on one of the principal streets, and saw, in front of a saloon across the way, a jeering crowd, and in the midst this man helplessly drunk, holding fast to a hitching-post, his body bent over sidewise at as near an angle of ninety degrees as it could be, and he was neither able to straighten up nor walk alone. Full of indignation at the crowd, the minister rushed across the street, thrust the jeering brutal men out of his way, took the drunkard's arm off the post and put it around his own neck, and, with his arm around the drunkard's body, walked him tenderly and safely home. He was too drunk to know of the proceeding, but he was told of it afterwards, and his acknowledgments to the pastor for the humiliation and disgrace to which he so kindly subjected himself, were touching in the extreme. Said the pastor, "I'll call it all square with you if you will sign the total abstinence pledge." He replied that he was not ready for that yet. Indeed, the minister's persuasions to a reformed life and to becoming a Christian seemed to produce no effect whatever. He was considered by all to be utterly incorrigible.

He had been more than ordinarily gifted by nature, and his capacity for business was reckoned the best in the town; but gradually, little by little his inebriety wrecked both his business and his health. The business had to be given up. As with so many drinking men, dropsy set in. Night and day for weeks and months, utterly unable to lie down, he sat, looking over toward and on into the future. The pastor was faithful in his visitations to the doomed man, never impatient, obtrusive, insistent, but always patient, gentle, tender, kind. As the end drew near, the man's whole mental attitude changed. His blasphemy ceased, his hard heart began to soften; the bitter feeling against Christians gave way; and with the humility and simplicity of a little child—often in the pastor's visits the Word of God was read and prayer was offered—he reached out his penitent hands to the Christ whom he had so long contemptuously spurned. He accepted Jesus as his Saviour, able to save to the uttermost, and died in the triumphs of the Christian faith.

An insistent question arises just here whose urge demands answer. The psychologist must, and the Christian believer gladly will, give reply.

What did it?

Notes and Comments

IT is estimated that 100,000 sermons in support of the National Council of Limitation of Armament were preached from American pulpits on November fourth. The executives of 18 Japanese labor unions in Tokyo and Yokohama recently endorsed the aims of the Washington conference and made a demand that the army be reduced by 50 per cent. John J. Tigert, Commissioner of Education, urges that the Conference on Limitation of Armament be made the subject of discussion in schools, clubs, churches and other organizations in order that the foundation of enduring peace may be laid upon a broad educational foundation. Hon. Julius Kahn, of California, chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, introduced a joint resolution requesting the American delegates to the Conference to take action toward bringing about a conference to consider the "thorough suppression of the manufacture and transportation of opium, morphine, cocaine and other habit-forming drugs" by international action. Madam Kaji Yajima, aged 90 years, came to America from Japan to present to President Harding a Peace Petition signed by thousands of her countrywomen. The Joshi Gakuin Guild School for Girls in Tokyo, raised the money with which to give Mrs. Yajima, who was one of the founders of the school, the opportunity of again coming to our country. For herself Mrs. Yajima says: "I have come to this country as a free individual, not in any official capacity, nor even in the representative capacity as a messenger of my country. I know no other language than my own, but God knows every language and I have come to pray with my American sisters. My countrywomen are supporting me with their prayers. I want every one to pray for world peace."

THE largest single gift ever received by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was recently placed in the hands of the officials of that organization by Garabed Melkonian, a wealthy Armenian in Alexandria, Egypt. This gift is one of \$2,000,000 for the Armenian nation, to be used for the founding and maintenance of two schools for girls and one for boys in Cilicia, and also for the establishment of a press. For thirty or fifty years the work is to be controlled by the American Board, the only limitation being that nothing in the nature of socialism or communism is to be taught.

THE world's population remains ever constant according to belief of the Druses of Hauran, Syria, recently reported in revolt against the French. Another of their peculiar ideas is that the earth will exist for 343,000,000 years and no more. Their religion forbids them to use alcohol, tobacco or profanity but bids them take a life for a life when one of their tribe is killed. Nominally Mohammedan, the Druses have embodied in their faith features of the teachings of the Bible, supplemented with ideas from various pagan sources.

When a stranger visits these strange people his host places before him two jars, one filled with water, the other empty. If the visitor is a Druse he will pour the water of one into the other to signify his belief in transmigration of souls. The Druses divide their adherents into two classes—intelligent and ignorant. Only the former are permitted to attend the Friday morning religious service. The "intelligents" must undergo a novitiate before they return to work.

The name "Druses" is traceable to Darazi, who proclaimed the divinity of the Fatimite Caliph Hakim, nearly 1000 years ago. The Druses believe that God revealed himself 10 times in human form, the last of these incarnations being Hakim, whose mysterious disappearance gave semblance to the prophecies that he will return. The Druses live on a fertile but treeless plain south of Damascus and east of the Sea of Galilee.

ONE of our good Canadian friends, in a letter enclosing his renewal, writes some pertinent things worth passing on: "I am enjoying the CHAMPION very much, and am passing on all the numbers to others from whom I'm hoping you may hear. The CHAMPION was never more needed than it is needed today. The mass of church goers seem to think their work is done when they attend church services, and they seem not to know more of what they hear than if they hadn't heard. Some have discernment but it would seem they are few. People go to church from the time their mothers carry them until gray hairs and bended shoulders, and have no more idea of how we are saved than if they were in darkest Africa and had never heard of a Saviour. It is shocking. But it is a great mercy to know there are those who are setting forth the unsearchable riches of Christ clearly and powerfully. May their number increase! With best wishes and prayers that you may be preserved true to the person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ in your magazine, and true to the Verbal Inspiration of the Word of God—the Bible—that is."

WE came across an article in the *Baptist* entitled "Bully for Billy!" After we had read the article we seconded that motion. It appears that Dr. W. W. Bustard, of Cleveland, was quite active in a mayoralty campaign. After the election the Dr. got a tip that he had better visit on a certain night. He took it and on that night his home was visited by five thugs who evidently sought his life. In one of his speeches he said among other things: "A good many people seem to think we have a mushy-hearted old grandfather for God. Read your Bible. We've had too much love and mercy preached here. What this town needs is a little more hell and judgment." "A lot of people think political matters should not be discussed in the churches. And the trouble in a lot of churches is that the people go there and sing themselves to bliss—or blisters. Organized religion today lacks backbone. It has ossification of the brain on a lot of moral issues. When they come up organized religion maintains a diplomatic silence. But I challenge any man to prove to me that religion has no place in public life just as

it has in private life. And my church is going to be a church with a civic consciousness." Good!

WOMEN may now be ordained as deacons in the Presbyterian Church, a majority of the presbyteries in that body having voted in favor of the admission of women to the ministry, reversing the decision made by the General Assembly several months ago, when the proposition was rejected but referred to the individual presbyteries for final decision.

DR. Sao Ke Alfred Sze, Chinese minister to the United States and one of the Conference delegates, tells the American people through the Federal Council of Churches that, "The educational work conducted in China through direct contact, by the various educational institutions and missionary bodies of this country, has been of such great benefit to China that it is beyond mere words to express. * * * These are the elements of Western culture which have given China a real insight into Western civilization and have shown us that Western scientific advancement means more than guns and battleships and engines of destruction."

ONE always admires folk who do things. More of our subscribers showed an interest in the CHAMPION this month than in the entire year of 1921. Some send one new, others more. All have our best thanks. But we cannot help making special mention of one of our *very* staunch friends who lives in one of our small western cities. Two years ago we mailed four CHAMPIONS to that city. About this time a conviction possessed this man that Christians in his city would be better Christians if they read the CHAMPION, and he set out to put his convictions into practice. That small city now gets a large bundle each month—has as many subscribers as many cities east and west having one hundred times as large a population.

We wonder how many others of our friends have this same conviction again and again but don't act! You would be surprised to know how many people send in subscriptions saying they happened to see a CHAMPION here or there! These people just happen to stumble across it. Just this morning a minister from Ohio writes: "I have just received my BIBLE CHAMPION as one of your new subscribers. I have been in the ministry 26 years and cannot understand why I didn't know about it so long." Also this mail brought us a note from a lady from a large New York city, who writes: "Allow me to congratulate you on the CHAMPION. Every issue seems finer than the preceding one. What will happen if this continues?" We could reel off a hundred similar to these every month or week. My, if all these good people would put their convictions into action—a thousand of them, and more—really, what *would* happen? Well, for one: many people would be better for it, your conscience would be eased, and the CHAMPION would be encouraged to do even more than you can expect of it. Won't you, and you, and you, try? Tell your friends about the CHAMPION—offer to send in his subscription.

AN encouraging sidelight on the religious interest of college students comes from Goucher College, where a questionnaire on the favorite books of the senior class reveals the fact that 96 of the 103 members of the class placed the Bible among their ten favorite books; 68 put the Bible first; 10 put it second; 6 put it third; 1 put it fourth; 2, fifth; 1, sixth; 4, seventh; 3, eighth, 4, ninth. Only seven failed to mention the Bible, and no one listed it last.

ON Thanksgiving Rev. Dr. P. H. Barker, of Point Breeze Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, preached a sermon at the Westinghouse wireless station in Pittsburgh, which was heard all over Canada and the United States east of the Rocky Mountains. Radio stations in Mexico and Cuba also picked up the sermon.

WITH the death of Abdul Baha at Haifa, Syria, the Bahai movement was left without a leader. It was reported that Bahaism will hereafter be directed by a council of 12. At the time the Turks were driven from Jerusalem Baha barely escaped being killed by them. Gen. Allenby occupying the town recognized his standing and knighted him. His grandson is a student at Oxford University. Baha had lectured in the United States.

Our Library Exchange Department

Advertising in this department is exclusively for Bible Champion Subscribers. Only articles used in a Library—Books, Typewriters, etc.—may be offered. Cash must accompany order at following rates: 10c a line for first insertion, and 8c a line for every insertion after first. Count 7 words to a line. Minimum charge 30c per insertion. Remit to Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

NOTE—Where only initials are given in address make money order payable to Bible Champion or order and payment will be forwarded to proper party.

WANTED—Copy of Dr. Gregory's "Why Four Gospels." Give conditions and price. Address B. S. Crane, 75 E. Park Lane, Atlanta, Ga.

New Books way below cost—Place of Christ in Modern Theology, *Fairbairne*, 75c. Scientific Faith, *Johnston*, 85c. Integrity of the Scriptures, *Smith*, 85c. Chronology, *Sayce*, 45c. The Pentateuch, *Evans*, 85c. Mystical Interpretations of the Gospels, *Thorburne*, \$1.25. All postpaid. Address A. B. C., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Second-Hand Books Cheap—all in good condition—Life of Christ, 8 vo. *Farrar*, \$1.25. Christ and Christianity, *Schaff*, \$1.25. Days of the Son of Man, *March*, \$1.00. The Broker Seal, *Greene*, 60c. Eclipse of Faith, 75c. History of American Methodism, *Stevens*, \$1.00. Discussion of Spiritualism, *Brittan & Richmond*, \$1.00. Ingersollism, *Wendling*, 50c. Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions, *Fernald*, 75c. Lives of Necromancers, *Godwin*, 60c. Hamilton's Mexican Hand Book, *Illus.*, 50c. Relations of the Republic and Laws of Religious Corporations, *Kynett*, 85c. Christ for India, *Lucas*, 60c. Mailed prepaid. Address B. C. D., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Books just like New—8 vols. Lange's Commentary—one vol. each on Job, Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Thessalonians, James, Revelations—\$1.75 each, or \$13.50 for set of 8 vols. Christ, His Nature and Works, 13 discourses, \$1.00. Teaching of Jesus, *Burrell*, 40c. Destruction of the Bible, *Panin*, 35c. Mailed prepaid. Address C. D. E., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Bargain in New Books—Chat about Celebrities, *Guild*, 75c. Golden Rule and Rule of Gold, *Schorb*, 40c. All Matter Tends to Rotation, *Hamilton*, 60c. Tarbell's Teachers' Guide for 1919, 75c. Modern Outcry again the Law, *Mead*. Up in Maine, *Day*, 50c. Mailed prepaid. Address G. H. I., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Offer portion of my Library, all New Books, at about half—The Wonderful Teacher, *Burrell*, 70c. Doubters and Their Doubts, *Darling*, 80c. Higher Critics of Bible and God's Bible, *Burns*, 65c. The Bible the Word of God, *Bettex*, 75c. Christianity's Greatest Peril, *Eckholm*, 65c. Genesis, *Evan*, 35c. Bible Steps Unto Heaven, *Carpenter*, 85c. Jesus as He was & is, *Craig*, 90c. Divine Movement in Israel, *Porter*, 75c. Great Books as Life Teachers, *Hillis*, 75c.; Must the Bible Go? *Wray*, 75c. Gift of Mind to Spirit, *Kulaner*. All sent prepaid. Address E. F. G., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Commended by Orthodox students. "The Burden of John," in the Plan of the four Gospels, and the Construction of the N. T. Single copy, 10c. R. W. Crichton, Union Star, MO.

FOR SALE—Letter Copying etaoineatoinetaonidition, like new, cost \$8.00, for \$2.50. Address H. I. J., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

New Books Cheap—Science and Revelation, 60c. Paradoxical Pain, *Harbin*, 75c. The Deathless Books, *Mears*, 75c. Naamah and Nimrod, *Tannehill*, 75c. Progress of Higher Freedom, *Schaff*, 75c. The Higher Criticism, *Rishell*, 60c. Postage prepaid. Address, F. G. H., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

New Book Bargains—Probation & Punishment, *Vernon*, 50c. Sanctified Spice, *Peters*, 40c. Pleasures of Literature & Solace of Books, 50c. Great Sermons by Great Preachers, \$1.00. The Listener in the Church, 40c.; The Yoke, *Piper*, 25c.; The Counter-Tenor Voice, 40c.; Wasson's Religious, Social & Political Essays, 75c.; Fenno's Science of Speech, 50c.; Jonah in Fact and Fancy, *Banks*, 35c. The Life that Really Is, *Abbott*, 60c. These prices are way below cost. All sent prepaid. Address I. J. K., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

FOR SALE—The World's Parliament of Religions, 2 vols., Morocco, New, \$3.00. Bible League Essays, new, *Levitt*, 50c. Why Four Gospels, *Gregory*, 60c. All prepaid. Address J. K. L., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Second-Hand Books Cheap—Jacobus' Notes, 40c—cost \$1.25; Dewey's Works, 75c—cost \$2.50; National and Universal Religions, 50c—cost \$1.50; Methods and Principle, 50c—cost \$1.50; Protestant Church in France, 50c—cost \$1.50; Took Basket—outlines of sermons and addresses—30c—cost 50c; Jonah in Fact and Fancy, 40c—cost 75c. Some like new, all good condition. All prepaid. Address K. L. M., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Second-Hand Books Cheap—Dictionary of Bible, *Smith*, 75c; Pronouncing Bible, very good full steel binding, old edition, page 5¾x9, with Book of Psalms in meter, \$1.25; Origin & History of Books of Bible, *Stowe*, 8 vo, \$1.25; N. T. Annotated Paragraph Bible, 8 vo, \$1.00; Platform Echoes, *Gough*, 8 vo, \$1.00; Psychology—the Motive Powers *McCosh*, 50c.; A Serious Question: What is Repentance? *Kinsey*, 50c; Poetical Works of Milton, 50c; Remarkable Answers to Prayer, Children's ed., 30c; The Old Way, *Rhoads*, Bird's Eye View Life of Christ, 35c; Convent Life Unveiled, *O'Gorman*, 25c; The Pope, the Jesuits & the People, *Shepherd*, paper, 20c. Address L. M. N., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

Good Books Cheap—all New—Miracles of Jesus, *Willets*, \$1.25. Christ in Literature, *Eggleston*, \$1.25. Thoughts on Holy Scriptures, *Bacon*, 50c. Unity and Trinity of the Human Race, *Baldwin*, 60c. True Prince of the Tribe of Judah, *Clark*, 75c. Miracles of Today, *Warring*, 50c. Sayings of Sages, *Bevoirs*, 40c. All prepaid. Address D. E. F., Bible Champion, Reading, Pa.

CHURCH FURNITURE
Pews, Pulpits, Chairs, Altars, Book
Racks, Tables, Desks—EVERYTHING.
The finest furniture made. Direct from our
factory to your church. Catalog free.
DeMoulin Bros. & Co. Dept. 79. Greenville, Ill.



A Frank Talk on Hosiery

Try us on Hosiery—you will be pleased. Many write us our line beats anything they have ever tried. We put conscience into every order.

Before war conditions prevailed the quality of our different grades of Hosiery equaled anything made anywhere. For about four years we hesitated to offer Hosiery, for it was about impossible to manufacture Hosiery we could stake our reputation on, and rather than offer what it was impossible to produce we offered none.

Conditions have changed. We can again offer Hosiery that will stand the acid test. Our New Line is now complete.

We know we can now again please you in both quality and price

NOTE OUR FOUR GRADES MEN'S SOCKS

No. 70—Best Peeler Yarn, Re-inforced double Heel and Toe, Lisle finish, all year round weight—a sock made to wear. Black and Colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

6 pairs, \$1.25; 12 pairs, \$2.25, prepaid.

No. 75—All year round weight, Fine combed Cable-twisted Lisle Cotton, Re-inforced double Heel and Toe, 200 needle—a Dressy, Durable Sock. Black and Colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

3 pairs, 90c; 6 pairs, \$1.75; 12 pairs, \$3.00, prepaid.

No. 77—At last we again offer this attractive Sock, made as it was made before the war—a perfect, semi-full fashion, seamed back, Tram Silk and Art mixed—the best combination silk made for wear—extra fine gauge; nothing more attractive at any price. Its wearing qualities will surprise you. Black and colors. Sizes 9 to 11½.

3 pairs, \$1.65; 6 pairs, \$3.25; 12 pairs, \$6.25, prepaid.

No. 80—Black with White Split Foot, Drop Heel that will not show when low shoes are worn, no seam across toe—specially recommended for Tender Feet. Greatest value we know of for all year round wear—we know of no hose to equal it. Only Black with White Soles. Sizes from 9 to 12.

3 pairs, \$1.25; 6 pairs, \$2.40; 12 pairs, \$4.50, prepaid.

LADIES' HOSE—THREE GRADES

No. 5—Select Peeler Yarn, Re-inforced Heel and Toe, Elastic Ribbed Garter Top, Fine Gauge, medium weight—a Reliable Hose, fully worth its cost. Black and White colors. Sizes 8½ to 10.

6 pairs, \$1.50; 12 pairs, \$2.75, prepaid.

No. 25—Very attractive Ladies' High Grade Mercerized Lisle Hose. While having the appearance of Silk Hose one pair of No. 25 will outwear several pairs of Silk Hose. Has Front Drop Stitch for low shoe wear, strong Garter Top, Double Sole and Double Heel and Toe, Fine Gauge, Semi-Full Fashion, with Seam Back. Sizes 8½ to 10.

3 pairs, \$1.65; 6 pairs, \$3.25; 12 pairs, \$6.25, prepaid.

No. 60—Black Beauty—Possesses unusual wearing qualities, and has an unusually Elastic Garter Top, is Semi-Full Fashioned, made from carefully selected yarn, High Lustre Ribbed Hose, knit with Triple Thread Heel and Toe. Extraordinary value. Black only. Sizes 8½ to 10.

3 pairs, \$1.65; 6 pairs, \$3.15; 12 pairs, \$6.00, prepaid.

Sample Box Men's Socks, 8 pairs—2 each Nos. 70, 75, 77, 80—\$2.60.

Sample Box Ladies' Hose, 6 pairs—2 each Nos. 5, 25 and 60—\$2.50.

Important. Good Hosiery are often condemned because a size smaller than should be worn is ordered; always order fully large in size or foot.

If shipment is to be forwarded insured add 3c for any amount ordered below \$5.00; and 5c for any amount above \$5.00.

BOYER MANUFACTURING CO., Reading, Pa.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly. \$3 a year

MELVIN GROVE KYLE

Moses and the Monuments: Light from Archaeology on Pentateuchal Times. Stone Lectures, 1919. 300 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid. (In press)

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism. 325 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$1.65, postpaid.

The Problem of the Pentateuch. 300 pp. 8vo, cloth, \$2.15, postpaid.

HAROLD M. WIENER

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. 255 pages. 8vo, cloth, \$1.50, postpaid.

The Coup de Grace to the Wellhausen Critics.

The Origin of the Pentateuch. 150 pages, 8vo, 40 cents, postpaid.

A Comprehensive Answer to the Wellhausen Critics.

Pentateuchal Studies. 350 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

The Wellhausen Critics in extremis.

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

The Ice Age in North America, and Its Bearings Upon the Antiquity of Man. 6th Edition. 210 illustrations. 808 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$6.00, postpaid.

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History. 3d Edition. 40 illustrations. 450 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

Origin and Antiquity of Man. Many illustrations. 550 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

Story of My Life and Work. 476 pages. 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, postpaid.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO., 6834 Washington Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

The Ideal Religious Newspaper

The Christian Work, Published Weekly at \$3.00 a Year

THE SURVEY OF THE WEEK—Happenings of the week in the world of events, with interpretation of its significance from the religious and social point of view. The history of daily events is the chronicle of the coming of the Kingdom of God in the world.

EDITORIALS—By the ablest writers in the Church: (1) Religious in the strictest sense of the word, dealing with the problems of thought and experience; (2) the application of religion to social, international, economic and political questions of the day. Also frequent editorials on the outstanding event of the week.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE—(1) A distinguished leader of the Church in various foreign countries writes occasional letters covering the progress of the Church and the significant happenings in the religious and social spheres in their own lands.

(2) An editorial correspondent who visits all of the annual conventions of the denominational bodies; all the inter-church conferences, such as the meeting of the Federal Council, the Foreign Missions Council, and the Home Missions Council; the various summer schools and conferences such as Northfield, Silver Bay, Winona, Chautauqua, Stony Brook; the conventions of any group that is doing the work of bettering humanity, industrial, civic, temperance, international peace, hearth, etc.

Other departments are: Contributor Articles, Foreign Mission, Correspondence, Book Reviews, and The Children's Department.

THE CHRISTIAN WORK, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City

NEW RELIGIOUS BOOKS

Contending for the Faith, by Leander S. Keyser, D.D. 8vo. Net, \$2.00. Essays in Constructive Criticism and Positive Apologetics. This able defence of orthodoxy will be sure of a warm welcome by all Christian students who recognize the importance and need of such a book as this, that calls with a voice of authority and conviction to a renewal of belief in the "faith once delivered."

One Thousand Evangelistic Illustrations, by Rev. Aquilla Webb, D.D., LL.D. Cloth, Oc., net \$3.00. President Mullins in his "Introduction" says, "I know of no collection equal in range and variety and forcefulness. It is a notable service to the cause of evangelism to prepare a volume of illustrations which the evangelistic preacher may keep at hand for the reinforcement of truth. Public speakers will find here a treasure-house of illustrative material."

Farrar's Life of Christ. New Edition. Cloth. Oct. Net, \$3.00. This great life of the Master will always be counted as a classic. It should be in every Bible Student's library.

Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. New Edition. Oct., Cloth, with many illustrations and maps. Net, \$3.00. A reprint of one of the most widely used and popular editions of this great book. It is doubtful if any other Bible Dictionary can ever supplant Dr. Smith's monumental and scholarly work for the use of the average Bible Student.

The Gardens of Life, by Rev. John Roach Straton, D.D., author of "The Menace of Immortality," Cloth, 12mo. Net, \$1.50. In contrast to his former volume of "Messages of Wrath and Judgment," Dr. Straton has gathered into this new book of sermons a series of "Messages of Cheer and Comfort," which will be found as beautiful and inspiring as his other discourses were electric and powerful.

How to Advertise a Church, by E. E. Elliott. 12mo. \$1.50. In this very practical and suggestive handbook the author tells how, when and where to advertise each department of the church and Sunday school.

The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, by Coneybeare and Howson. New Edition. With Maps and Illustrations. Cloth. Oct. Net, \$3.00. This monumental work on the great apostle and his writings will always remain a standard and indispensable book for the Christian Student's library.

Heralds of a Passion, by Rev. Charles L. Goodell, D.D. Cloth. 12mo. Net, \$1.50. Dr. Goodell maintains that everything great in life is a passion, and religion being a life must be impassioned. The symbol of our religion is a Cross, and He who hung upon it was a man of infinite passion. We are to be heralds of that passion. How can we be heralds of it, if we do not feel it? In many quarters the Church seems to have lost the fine flavor of its early rapture. In some way we must win back that early enthusiasm. The author shows the passion which was upon the hearts of the prophets, the apostles and the reformers. The book is a passionate appeal to ministers and laymen to give themselves without stint and with infinite yearning to the salvation and service of men.

The Practice of Christ's Presence, by Rev. W. Y. Fullerton. Cloth, 12mo. Net, \$1.00. The fourth edition of a "new and revised edition" of this modern "Practice of the Presence of God." Dr. Alexander Whyte said of it "This is a masterly book. It is the simple truth to say that it ranks beside Brother Lawrence's book and Jeremy Taylor. I have gone back to Brother Lawrence's book only to return to Mr. Fullerton's with greater appreciation, benefit and delight."

Revival Sermons, by Gipsy Smith. Cloth, 12mo. Net, \$1.50. These sermons by the world famous Evangelist were preached in America during his visit in the spring of 1921. They represent the Gipsy at the very zenith of his powers. Tens of thousands who have heard him will wish to have this permanent record of his eloquence and heart-reaching appeal. The book will bear his wonderful gospel message to thousands who have not and may never hear him.

Prayer and Praying Men, by Rev. Edward M. Bounds. 12mo. Net, \$1.25. The author of "Preacher and Prayer" has in this volume given us a new insight into the spiritual life of the praying men of the Bible. From Abraham to Paul he covers in his own inimitable way the history of prayer in the Holy Scriptures.

The Book of Personal Work by John F. Faris, D.D. 12mo. Net, \$1.25. Doctor Faris has gathered in this inspiring volume a series of concrete instances of soul winning. They will fire imagination and generate the "Will to Save." Indispensable to ministers, evangelists and Christian workers in illustrating addresses.

The Training of the Twelve by Alexander Balmain Bruce, D.D. 8vo. Net, \$2.00. This great work of Dr. Bruce's has long been recognized as the standard on the personality of the Apostles and the teaching they received.

Reunion in Eternity, by Sir Wm Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D. 12mo. Net, \$1.50. "A strangely valuable record of Christian thought upon the character of the life beyond death. Illuminated throughout by Sir Nicoll's wide acquaintance with literature." *The Times*.

The Redeemed Family of God by Rev. J. H. Jowett, M.A. 12mo. Net, \$1.25. This great spiritual leader finds in the first and second Epistles of Peter full directions for the attitude of the Christian to all the relations of domestic life. This is Dr. Jowett at his best, the poetry of spirituality blended with a practical knowledge of life in all its aspects.

The Importance and Value of Proper Bible Study: How properly to study and interpret the Bible, by R. A. Torrey, D.D. 12mo. Net, \$1.25. This book is designed to impress the reader with the importance and value of Bible study—to enable busy men and women to derive the most benefit from their Bible study and to set forth the fundamental principles of correct Biblical Interpretation.

Address FRANK J. BOYER, Publisher, Reading Pa.